

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:

Paul E. Dampman,
Edson C. Oak,
Arthur H. Rice,
Clarence A. Richards, and
David W. Bagley.

ENSIGN.

Midshipman Roy Le C. Stover to be an ensign.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons:

John G. Ziegler, a citizen of Pennsylvania;
Glenmore F. Clark, a citizen of Kentucky;
William M. Kerr, a citizen of New York;
George A. Riker, a citizen of New York; and
Tharos Harlan, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

POSTMASTERS.

FLORIDA.

Charles S. Williams, at Key West, Fla.

OHIO.

James K. Allen, at Greenwich, Ohio.
William T. Orton, at West Unity, Ohio.

TENNESSEE.

Andrew N. Brown, at Woodbury, Tenn.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 29, 1909.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, of the city of Washington.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

STATISTICS RELATING TO SUGAR.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to Senate resolution No. 19, of the 1st instant, certain information relative to the amount of sugar consumed by the people of the United States for the fiscal year 1908, etc. (S. Doc. No. 24), which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

TARIFF STATISTICS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting, in response to Senate resolution No. 36, of the 23d instant, a table of rates of duty in the United States; Germany, and France on pottery, glass bottles, plate glass, iron ore, etc. (S. Doc. No. 23), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SCOTT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Metz, Mannington, Morgantown, and Rosbys Rock, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Gillett, Tex., and of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the erection of a suitable memorial in Statuary Hall to the memory of James Rumsey, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. PILES presented petitions of sundry citizens of Alderton, Tumwater, Everett, and Kennewick, all in the State of Washington, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Clarks Green, Uniontown, Gastonville, and Meadville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of 278 citizens of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the drawback feature contained in the so-called "Payne tariff" bill, relative to tin plates, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry employees of the Madeira and Wannery Hosiery Mill, of Fleetwood, Pa., praying for the retention of the proposed duty on hosiery, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange, No. 52, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rasselas, Pa., praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry employees of the Union Razor Company, of Tidioute, Pa., praying for the retention of the proposed duty on imported razors, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Schatt & Morgan Cutlery Company, of Titusville, Pa., and a petition of sundry employees of the Schatt & Morgan Cutlery Company, of Titusville, Pa., praying for the retention of the proposed duty on imported knives or erasers, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GAMBLE presented the petition of W. A. Hopkins and sundry other citizens of Hayes, S. Dak., praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of White Oak Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Warren, Me., praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Maine, remonstrating against an increase of the duty on gloves, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I present a telegram from the secretary of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and ask that it may be read for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, April 22, 1909.

HON. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The American Newspaper Publishers' Association, at its annual meeting in New York to-day, with the largest attendance in the history of the organization, comprising representatives of 290 daily newspapers, has instructed me as its secretary to telegraph and write to you that the association, by a rising vote, with only three dissenters, earnestly urges the confirmation by the Senate of the action of the House of Representatives in the matter of pulp and paper. I am sending by mail full text of minutes, adopted by association.

E. H. BAKER, Secretary.

Mr. ELKINS presented a memorial of the thirty-eighth legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRITORY OF NEW MEXICO,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

Certificate of comparison.

I, Nathan Jaffa, secretary of the Territory of New Mexico, do hereby certify that there was filed for record in this office, at 11:55 o'clock p. m., on the 18th day of March, A. D. 1909, council joint memorial No. 7, Mr. President; and, also, that I have compared the following copy of the same with the original thereof now on file, and declare it to be a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the Territory of New Mexico, at the city of Santa Fe, the capital, on this 26th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.]

NATHAN JAFFA,
Secretary of New Mexico.

Council joint memorial 7. Mr. President.

Memorializing Congress for an appropriation of money or land scrip for the purpose of relieving the counties of Santa Fe and Grant, in the Territory of New Mexico, from the burden imposed upon them respectively by former congressional statutes confirming and validating certain bonds of each of the said counties issued without lawful authority.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Whereas the county of Santa Fe, N. Mex., is overburdened and distressed by the weight of a bonded indebtedness now approximating in amount \$1,000,000, based on illegal railroad-aid bonds, converted into illegal refunding bonds, which although such bonds could not be successfully enforced in the courts after the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Pima County case, below more particularly referred to, were, in avoidance of that decision, confirmed and validated by Congress in and by an act entitled "An act approving certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, authorizing the issue of certain bonds of said Territory, and for other purposes," the same having become a law, without the approval of the President, January 16, 1897 (see Stat. L., vol. 29, pp. 487, 488, and 489; chap. 30):

Whereas the said indebtedness originated in the following manner and under the following circumstances, to wit:

1. The said indebtedness results, to an amount exceeding one-half thereof, from the issue by the county of Santa Fe, in February, 1880, of bonds in the principal sum of \$150,000, bearing interest at the rate of 7 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, in aid of the construction of the New Mexico and Southern Pacific Railroad (now part of the "Santa Fe route"), so far as that railroad extends in the said county, including a branch line of about 20 miles in tortuous length from Lamy Junction to the city of Santa Fe, and the remainder of the said indebtedness results from the issue by the said county, at a later date, of bonds in the principal sum of \$150,000, bearing interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, in aid of the construction of the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad (now part of the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad system), from the city of Santa Fe to Espanola, the southern termination at that time of the railroad of the late Denver and Rio Grande Railway Company.

2. The total assessed valuation of the property subject to taxation in the county of Santa Fe is about \$2,200,000.

3. All the aforesaid railroad-aid bonds, with one judgment for interest on a part of the said first bond issue, were, before the rendering of the decision in the Pima County case (Oct. 29, 1894, *Lewis v. Pima County*, 155 U. S. 54), refunded under the provisions of a territorial refunding act (chapter 79 of the session laws of 1891, found in the compiled laws of New Mexico of 1897 as sections 340 to 348, both inclusive), which refunding act, it is evident, does not authorize the refunding of bonds void on their face.

4. Over and above the said railroad-aid indebtedness the said county has a legitimate interest-bearing bonded indebtedness of about \$200,000.

5. All of the said railroad-aid bonds were issued under the supposed authority of chapter 30 of the New Mexico session laws of 1872, still found in the said compiled laws as sections 3898 to 3901, both inclusive, which statute of 1872 could, under the doctrine announced in the Pima County case, no longer legally operate after the passage of the act of Congress, approved June 8, 1878 (20 Stat. L., p. 101), which prohibited every "municipal corporation" in a Territory from incurring "any debt or obligation other than such as shall be necessary to the administration of its internal affairs."

6. The bonds in aid of the New Mexico and Southern Pacific Railroad Company were, under the belief that the said territorial act of 1872 was still in force, and pursuant to its provisions, voted for on the 4th day of October, 1879, in two concurrent elections, one upon the proposition to aid to the extent of \$71,000 in the construction of the main line crossing the said county, and the other upon the proposition to aid to the extent of \$79,000 in the construction of a branch line connecting the city of Santa Fe with the main line at Lamy Junction.

The votes cast on the first proposition numbered only 259, of which 192 were in the affirmative and 67 in the negative; and the total vote cast on the second proposition numbered only 266, of which 190 were in the affirmative and 76 in the negative.

8. At that time—1879—the total number of voters qualified to vote in the county of Santa Fe at general elections, including resident owners of taxable property as well as residents not such owners, exceeded 1,000, but by the terms of the said railroad-aid statute of 1872 very few of the general electors were qualified to vote at the special elections believed to be thereby authorized, because such elections were determined under that statute by the votes exclusively of "the electors of the various precincts of said county who own taxable property." (New Mexico Compiled Laws of 1897, p. 3899.)

Under the exemption statutes in force at the time of the said railroad-aid elections, respectively, every resident was immune from taxation of property to the amount of \$300, not to speak of other exemptions from taxation more specific in character, and the great majority of such residents at the time of each of the said special elections had severally no property subject to taxation. This fact, taken in connection with the general ignorance then prevailing in the county of the English language and of the method of American corporate business, accounts for the apparent passivity of the great majority of its residents on the occasions of the special elections concerning the said railroad aids. Railroads were still unsolved mysteries to the great majority of the territorial population. Most of those of Mexican ancestry were characteristically simple in their habits, confiding in their nature, attentive to religious duties, and devoted to pastoral and agricultural pursuits after the ancient manner of their forefathers. The first influence of the incoming railroads was prejudicial a generation ago to the native population of New Mexico, for it diminished by eastern competition their accustomed home markets, and was subversive of old-time social conditions.

This first influence of the railroads was felt conspicuously by the county of Santa Fe. The main line of the "Santa Fe Route" did not come nearer to the city of Santa Fe than 20 miles, although from time immemorial that city had been the emporium and distributing point of New Mexico, and, under the Spanish, Mexican, and American rule, the seat of an important and money distributing military, as well as civil, government. The advent of the first railroad destroyed the "Santa Fe trail" and the commerce which over that trail had centered in Santa Fe for generations. Santa Fe's importance was temporarily impaired, her old trade distributed among other places more favored by railroad communication, and yet, as consideration for the burden of the first aid by the county bonds, voted at the two-headed election of 1879, she was, in respect of railroad transportation, accorded only the small favor of the railroad branch from Lamy Junction, and even that supposed benefit was conditioned on the county's contribution to the construction of the main line, a contribution not, it is believed, exacted of any other county since the main line was to be built, at all events.

9. In fact, it was a great detriment to the city of Santa Fe to be thus sidetracked on a branch line of railroad, and naturally her commercial residents looked forward to the advantages apparently in prospect from the incoming of the main line of the old Denver and Rio Grande Railway Company under its chartered right and duty to construct its main line into New Mexico, as far south as Santa Fe, conformably to the acts of Congress requiring such construction to be completed as early as June 10, 1882. But, although chartered and subsidized by Congress, the old Denver and Rio Grande Railway Company failed to meet that statutory requirement, and even entered into a compact with its rival, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad Company—the indirect beneficiary of the said first railroad aid—by which, early in 1880, further construction of the Denver and Rio Grande Railway south of Espanola was inequitably pretermitted for the period of ten years from that date. In view of this new disappointment, and for the immediate purpose of bridging the gap in railroad communication between the city of Santa Fe and the Denver and Rio Grande Railway at Espanola—from which point that railway was in operation to the north through Pueblo, Denver, and other business centers—the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad Company was incorporated and the second county aid voted as aforesaid.

10. But notwithstanding these efforts for amelioration of the evil conditions flowing from the innovation of railroads in a community accustomed to the simple life of the old Spanish and Mexican days the property and business interests of the inhabitants of the county became almost stagnant, and so continued for a whole generation. It was absolutely impossible for the county to pay the interest on the railroad-aid bonds, still less any part of the principal. Indeed, the accumulated interest is now a heavier burden than the principal and is subject to increase by compounding under judgments and future refundings, because Congress has confirmed and validated the county's void indebtedness.

11. All these railroad-aid bonds appear to have been negotiated by the respective companies concerned and to have come into the hands of purchasers for value, and, since their conversion into refunding bonds, the county is confronted by present holders of the new bonds, who bought them in reliance on the confirmatory acts of Congress.

12. In the year 1887 the board of county commissioners of the county of Santa Fe was sued upon a large number of interest coupons clipped from the bonds issued as aid to the New Mexico and Southern Pacific Railroad Company, and there followed in that and collateral

legal proceedings a most energetic litigation, finally resulting in a decision of the supreme court of New Mexico, August 12, 1891, adjudging the validity of the coupons, which decision is reported in 6 New Mexico Reports (Gild.), 88.

13. Prior to this decision, the legislative assembly of New Mexico passed said chapter 79, of the session laws of 1891, looking to the refunding of all outstanding valid indebtedness of counties and municipalities.

14. After that decision of the supreme court of New Mexico, not only the judgment in which the interest coupons involved were merged (with interest compounded on those coupons), but also the outstanding principal indebtedness evidenced by the railroad-aid bonds, and all arrears of interest, not merged in that judgment, and, furthermore, the principal and interest evidenced by the aid bonds and coupons issued to the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad Company, all coming within the doctrine so announced by the supreme court of New Mexico, were converted into refunding bonds of the county under the said chapter 79.

15. It is true that in a dissenting opinion in that case Mr. Justice Freeman took the ground that all the said railroad-aid bonds were void ab initio under a proper construction of the said act of Congress of June 8, 1878 (20 Stat., 101). But it was then the opinion of the majority of the justices, as well as of some of the leading lawyers of the Territory, that the congressional prohibition could not be extended to a county, although governed by a board of county commissioners, by any proper interpretation of the words "or other municipal corporation." Therefore the county failed to sue out a writ of error from the Supreme Court of the United States for review of the said judgment, and took it for granted that no relief could be had in the courts from the burden of the railroad-aid indebtedness.

16. However, in the year 1894 the Supreme Court of the United States, in the above-mentioned Arizona case, *Lewis v. Pima County* (155 U. S., 54), distinctly held, without any dissent, that the prohibition in the act of Congress above cited extends to railroad-aid bonds issued by counties in the Territories, although so issued strictly in conformity with the provisions of a general act of the territorial legislative assembly. For that reason the Pima County bonds involved in that case were held to be void.

17. Later, Congress, in view of the Pima County case, passed the aforesaid act of 1897, expressly validating all bonds of the county of Santa Fe which had been refunded under the terms of the above-cited chapter 79 of the New Mexico Session Laws of 1891. This confirmatory act of Congress, by its broad terms, absolutely excluded the county of Santa Fe from any relief whatever in the courts from the oppression of the said railway-aid indebtedness, no matter how great its original invalidity, and thus the present generation of Santa Fe County's inhabitants, including numerous worthy settlers recently from the East, are face to face with a demon of poverty for whose invocation they are in no respect responsible.

18. Notwithstanding the failure of the county of Santa Fe to secure, within the space of time allowed by law, a writ of error from the Supreme Court of the United States for a review of the aforesaid decision, Congress probably had, in its tutelar relation to the Territories, constitutional power, even after the promulgation of the decision in the Pima County case, to authorize a review by that high tribunal of the New Mexico judgment. At all events, that territorial decision could not debar a review by the Supreme Court of the United States of future territorial decisions affecting railroad-aid indebtedness for the principal or for later maturing interest coupons of any such railroad-aid bonds, or resulting county refunding bonds.

19. That territorial judgment could not, in any view, be deemed res judicata, except as to those privy to the litigation, and there were many outstanding bondholders, including all holders of bonds issued in aid of the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad Company, who were in no sense whatever entitled to invoke that judgment as an estoppel.

The want of power in the county to issue the railway-aid bonds, as declared in the Pima County case, was constructively imputable to every holder of such bonds, since the bonds all originated after the prohibitive act of Congress considered in that case, every purchaser of a municipal bond issued either in a State or in a Territory, being put on inquiry as to the power of the municipality to issue it, and no recital saving him from the duty of such inquiry.

20. Again, until the passage in 1897 of the confirmatory act of Congress before mentioned, every holder of a refunding bond which showed on its face that the debt funded was absolutely void in its inception and, whatever the form of the refunding bonds, every original refunder and every original purchaser of a refunding bond who knew that the indebtedness refunded by that bond was within the class of municipal indebtedness denounced by the act of Congress of 1878, discussed in the Pima County case, was powerless to enforce such bond in the courts, notwithstanding the most "binding" recitals appearing on its face.

21. But in 1897, before the county of Santa Fe was advised of its right and opportunity, under the decision of the court of last resort in the Pima County case, Congress passed the above cited confirmatory act, which operated, on the one hand, to protect every holder of the void railroad-aid bonds as refunded, and on the other hand, to deprive the county of Santa Fe of its right of defense against the bondholders, and almost of its right to exist on a political plane comports with the civic merit of its citizens and worthy of its ancient dignity as the capital of the vast subkingdom out of which the States of Colorado, Utah, and Nevada have since in great part sprung—New Mexico and Arizona only remaining as Territories.

Whereas the county of Grant, N. Mex., is aggrieved and burdened in like manner, although not so egregiously, by the validation by the said act of Congress of her void railroad-aid indebtedness; and

Whereas it is the sense of this legislative assembly that on the eve of New Mexico's emergence out of the territorial condition into the full dignity of statehood Congress ought, on grounds of political equity, to relieve the county of Santa Fe from the hard plight in which it has been left by adverse national legislation in which the Territory of New Mexico had no representative vote: Therefore be it

Resolved by the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested by an appropriation of money or assignable land script to enable the counties of Santa Fe and Grant, N. Mex., to compromise, satisfy, and discharge so much of their respective bonded indebtedness (principal, with accrued and accruing interest), validated and confirmed by the act of Congress of January 16, 1897, as was originally embraced in the refunding by the county of Santa Fe of the principal and interest of its railroad-aid

bonds issued to the New Mexico and Southern Pacific Railroad Company and in the judgment mentioned in the said act of 1897, as well as in the refunding by the county of Santa Fe of the principal and interest of its railroad-bond bonds issued to the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad Company, and also as was originally embraced in the issue by the county of Grant of its railroad-bond bonds under the supposed authority of the territorial railroad-aid act of 1872, but after its repeal by the act of Congress of 1878; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the territory be, and hereby is, directed to make and transmit seven copies of this memorial to our Delegate in Congress, one for himself and the others to be transmitted by him, one to the President of the Senate, one to the Speaker of the House, one to Senator ELKINS, two to the Senators from Colorado, respectively; two to the chairmen, respectively, of the proper Senate and House committees.

CHAS. A. SPIESS,
President of the Council.

WM. F. BBOGAN,
Chief Clerk Council.

E. A. MIERA,
Speaker House of Representatives.

E. H. SALAZAR,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

Approved this 18th day of March, 1909.

GEORGE CURRY,
Governor of New Mexico.

Filed in office of secretary of New Mexico, March 18, 1909, 11.55 p. m.
NATHAN JAFFA, Secretary.

Mr. JONES presented petitions of sundry citizens of Okanogan, Kent, and Everett, all in the State of Washington, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. STONE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Chesterfield, Trenton, Doniphan, Napier, Forest City, Richwood, Meadville, Faucett, Dickens, Taneyville, Keytesville, Milo, Cadmus, and Wesco, all in the State of Missouri, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Farmers' Union of Laclede County, Mo., praying that an appropriation be made for the maintenance of the Country Life Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a memorial of the Century Club, of Monroe City, Mo., remonstrating against an increase of the duty on gloves, hosiery, and other wearing apparel, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Silex, Mo., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "postal savings banks" bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. DEPEW presented a petition of the American Oriental Society, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the admission free of duty of imported scientific books dealing with foreign languages, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry employees of the Walden Knife Company, of Walden; of the Geneva Cutlery Company, of Geneva; of Foster Brothers & Chatillon, of Fulton; and of the Schrade Cutlery Company, of Walden, all in the State of New York, praying for the retention of the proposed duty on imported knives or erasers, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for an increase of the duty on lithographic products, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry wholesale merchants of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against an increase of the duty on cotton goods, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York, praying for an increase of the duty on print paper and wood pulp, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Troy, Hastings-on-Hudson, Cherry Creek, Elmira, Waverly, Turin, Fish Creek, Vloosville, Flatbuck, Patterson, Brooklyn, all in the State of New York, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry employees of the Robeson Cutlery Company, of Perry; the Carrier Cutlery Company, of Elmira; the Warwick Knife Company, of Warwick; the Case Brothers Cutlery Company, of Little Valley; the George W. Korn Razor Manufacturing Company, of Little Valley; the Napanoch Knife Company, of Napanoch; the Ulster Knife Company, of Ellenville; the Cattaraugus Cutlery Company, of Little Valley; the New York Knife Company, of Walden; the Foster Brothers & Chatillon, of Fulton; the Geneva Cutlery Company, of Geneva; the Schrade Cutlery Company, of Walden; the Walden Knife Company, of Walden; and of sundry merchants and citizens of Walden, all in the State of New York, praying for the retention of the proposed duty on imported knives or erasers, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HALE presented petitions of sundry citizens of East Corinth, Troy, Portland, Unity, Bar Harbor, Augusta, Winthrop, Pittsfield, South Penobscot, Bangor, Lubec, Bridgewater, and Stetson, all in the State of Maine, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McLAURIN:

A bill (S. 2034) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Knox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 2035) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Wolcott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURROWS:

A bill (S. 2036) to authorize the city of Sturgis, Mich., to construct a dam across the St. Joseph River; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 2037) referring the claim of Robert Munroe, surviving partner of Watson & Munroe, to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2038) granting a pension to Isaac Wise;

A bill (S. 2039) granting a pension to Jacob B. Scheid (with the accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 2040) to amend an act entitled "An act making it a misdemeanor in the District of Columbia to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or of his or her minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances," approved March 23, 1906; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BULKELEY:

A bill (S. 2041) to establish a light-house on East Reef, near Thimble Islands, Long Island Sound; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 2042) granting an increase of pension to George W. Tilghman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 2043) granting to the State of Wyoming 50,000 acres of land to aid in the continuation, enlargement, and maintenance of the Wyoming State Soldiers and Sailors' Home; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 2044) granting a pension to Janie Atnip; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 2045) for the relief of John B. Lord, owner of lot 86, square 723, Washington, D. C., with regard to assessment and payment of damages on account of changes of grade due to construction of the Union Station, District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WETMORE:

A bill (S. 2046) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Ball (with the accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 2047) amending section 5240 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2048) to amend the act approved July 2, 1890, entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against any unlawful restraints and monopolies;" and

A bill (S. 2049) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the eastern district of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2050) to provide for the completion of the park surrounding the filtration plant in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 2051) to provide for the erection of a public building at Agricultural College, Mich., and the establishment of a Weather Bureau station therein; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 2052) to grant an honorable discharge to Cornelius De Haas; and

A bill (S. 2053) to transfer Capt. John Clarke Wilson from the retired list to the active list of the navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2054) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Big Rapids, Mich.; and
 A bill (S. 2055) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Charlotte, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
 A bill (S. 2056) naturalizing Charles W. Hilliker;
 A bill (S. 2057) naturalizing George Drought; and
 A bill (S. 2058) naturalizing Charles Walkley LaDu; to the Committee on Immigration.
 A bill (S. 2059) for the relief of Sophie M. Guard;
 A bill (S. 2060) for the relief of I. Winslow Ayer;
 A bill (S. 2061) for the relief of Orlando B. Willcox and certain other army officers and their heirs or legal representatives;
 A bill (S. 2062) for the relief of Clarence A. Rendt; and
 A bill (S. 2063) for the relief of John W. McCrath; to the Committee on Claims.
 A bill (S. 2064) to quiet title to certain land in Dona Ana County, N. Mex.; and
 A bill (S. 2065) to authorize the sale of dead, down, and injured timber in Alpena and Roscommon counties, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Lands.
 A bill (S. 2066) for the establishment of a light-house and fog signal at the easterly end of Michigan Island, Apostle Group, westerly end of Lake Superior, Wisconsin;
 A bill (S. 2067) to make Holland, in the State of Michigan, a subport of entry, and for other purposes; and
 A bill (S. 2068) to make Petoskey, in the State of Michigan, a subport of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.
 A bill (S. 2069) to correct the military record of Capt. Daniel H. Powers (with the accompanying papers);
 A bill (S. 2070) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to enter on the roll of the Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry the name of William J. Shirley;
 A bill (S. 2071) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William T. Lang;
 A bill (S. 2072) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Reed;
 A bill (S. 2073) granting an honorable discharge to Benjamin W. Ehle;
 A bill (S. 2074) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David Houk;
 A bill (S. 2075) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Neveau;
 A bill (S. 2076) granting an honorable discharge to Glenn Bennett;
 A bill (S. 2077) granting an honorable discharge to Adam D. Shriner;
 A bill (S. 2078) granting an honorable discharge to Henry S. Hunter;
 A bill (S. 2079) to correct the military record of Clark G. Russell;
 A bill (S. 2080) to regarrison Fort Mackinac and maintain the same as a military post;
 A bill (S. 2081) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Esseltine;
 A bill (S. 2082) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Earl Hoisington, jr.;
 A bill (S. 2083) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry Fuller;
 A bill (S. 2084) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Andrew Martin; and
 A bill (S. 2085) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Malloy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
 A bill (S. 2086) granting an increase of pension to Peter Boyer;
 A bill (S. 2087) granting an increase of pension to Francis G. Bourasaw;
 A bill (S. 2088) granting a pension to Almira J. Sterling;
 A bill (S. 2089) granting an increase of pension to Josiah M. Rice;
 A bill (S. 2090) granting an increase of pension to John A. Battenfield;
 A bill (S. 2091) granting a pension to Rachel F. Prince;
 A bill (S. 2092) granting an increase of pension to Silas Wright;
 A bill (S. 2093) granting a pension to George Seward;
 A bill (S. 2094) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Turner;
 A bill (S. 2095) granting an increase of pension to Isaac R. Jameson;
 A bill (S. 2096) granting a pension to W. H. Rugg;
 A bill (S. 2097) granting a pension to Allen B. Be Dell;
 A bill (S. 2098) granting an increase of pension to Albert L. T. Bush;

A bill (S. 2099) granting a pension to Alvena Wiggins;
 A bill (S. 2100) granting a pension to Emma L. Parker;
 A bill (S. 2101) granting an increase of pension to Sidney M. Smith;
 A bill (S. 2102) granting an increase of pension to Martin Selak;
 A bill (S. 2103) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Morse;
 A bill (S. 2104) granting a pension to Agnes Hunt (with the accompanying paper);
 A bill (S. 2105) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Philbrick;
 A bill (S. 2106) granting an increase of pension to Charles Moulton;
 A bill (S. 2107) granting an increase of pension to George Alexander;
 A bill (S. 2108) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin S. Whitman;
 A bill (S. 2109) granting a pension to Lydia A. Brigham;
 A bill (S. 2110) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Moore;
 A bill (S. 2111) granting an increase of pension to Elias Riegler;
 A bill (S. 2112) granting a pension to William Cordes;
 A bill (S. 2113) granting an increase of pension to Marshall H. Burnham;
 A bill (S. 2114) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. S. Duryea;
 A bill (S. 2115) granting an increase of pension to Jane A. Ecker;
 A bill (S. 2116) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Norris;
 A bill (S. 2117) granting an increase of pension to John M. Randall;
 A bill (S. 2118) granting an increase of pension to George M. Peaslee;
 A bill (S. 2119) granting a pension to Margaret A. Barker;
 A bill (S. 2120) granting a pension to George W. Derby;
 A bill (S. 2121) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Houghton;
 A bill (S. 2122) granting a pension to Mary Caroline Douglas;
 A bill (S. 2123) granting a pension to Emma R. Walters;
 A bill (S. 2124) granting a pension to Louisa E. Lawrence;
 A bill (S. 2125) granting a pension to Sarah Elsie Green;
 A bill (S. 2126) granting an increase of pension to Caroline E. Sweet;
 A bill (S. 2127) granting a pension to Lucinda W. Van Hyning;
 A bill (S. 2128) granting an increase of pension to Renselarr B. Ransom;
 A bill (S. 2129) granting an increase of pension to Gardner B. Clark;
 A bill (S. 2130) granting an increase of pension to George A. Brown;
 A bill (S. 2131) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Stebbins;
 A bill (S. 2132) granting an increase of pension to Frank D. Newberry;
 A bill (S. 2133) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Golding;
 A bill (S. 2134) granting an increase of pension to Lyman G. Willcox;
 A bill (S. 2135) granting a pension to Mary E. Smith;
 A bill (S. 2136) granting a pension to Annie B. Jackson;
 A bill (S. 2137) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Gaylord;
 A bill (S. 2138) granting a pension to Hiram S. Millis;
 A bill (S. 2139) granting a pension to Emma J. Pride;
 A bill (S. 2140) granting a pension to Anna E. Warden;
 A bill (S. 2141) granting a pension to Cynthia A. Slayton;
 A bill (S. 2142) granting an increase of pension to David Collins;
 A bill (S. 2143) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Barton;
 A bill (S. 2144) granting an increase of pension to Eunice C. Wickware;
 A bill (S. 2145) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Morrow;
 A bill (S. 2146) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mulliken;
 A bill (S. 2147) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Stroup;
 A bill (S. 2148) granting a pension to Archie H. Wright;
 A bill (S. 2149) granting an increase of pension to William S. Dailey;
 A bill (S. 2150) granting an increase of pension to Artemus Ward;
 A bill (S. 2151) granting a pension to Eliza Bracelin;
 A bill (S. 2152) granting an increase of pension to Jacob R. Riblet;

A bill (S. 2153) granting an increase of pension to Geraldine Tift;

A bill (S. 2154) granting an increase of pension to Henry O. Briggs;

A bill (S. 2155) granting an increase of pension to James Malloy;

A bill (S. 2156) granting a pension to Sarah J. Fitzgibbon;

A bill (S. 2157) granting a pension to Sarah J. Fix;

A bill (S. 2158) granting a pension to Jennie Dunn;

A bill (S. 2159) granting a pension to Verona H. Coon;

A bill (S. 2160) granting a pension to Lucy Ann Palmer;

A bill (S. 2161) granting a pension to Frankie Esselstyn;

A bill (S. 2162) granting an increase of pension to George M. Horton;

A bill (S. 2163) granting a pension to John C. Hurst;

A bill (S. 2164) granting a pension to Helen Mirrin;

A bill (S. 2165) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Forman;

A bill (S. 2166) granting a pension to Samuel Limenstall;

A bill (S. 2167) granting a pension to Leonard C. Wiswell;

A bill (S. 2168) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Vahue;

A bill (S. 2169) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Marsh;

A bill (S. 2170) granting a pension to Emeline C. Seger;

A bill (S. 2171) granting an increase of pension to Wharton R. Marsh;

A bill (S. 2172) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Wiggins;

A bill (S. 2173) granting a pension to Mary A. Dawes; and

A bill (S. 2174) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Sedgwick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCUMBER. Before we pass from those bills, I wish to ask if they were all introduced by one Senator?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. They were all introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. McCUMBER. Then I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan, so as to guide to a certain extent the Committee on Pensions, the number of surviving soldiers in the State of Michigan, and how that number compares with the number of bills he has just introduced.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I refer the distinguished Senator to the records of the Grand Army of the Republic in the State of Michigan, and he will find his question answered.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is evidently true that the Senator knows what the records are and the number. I do not myself know, and therefore I ask him.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I know that these bills represent a very small proportion of the gallantry the State of Michigan furnished.

Mr. CULBERSON. I should like to know how many of these pension bills have just been introduced by the Senator from Michigan, in view of the inquiry of the Senator from North Dakota.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has not counted them. The Secretary will count them, if the Senator desires. There are quite a number.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that the Senator from Michigan has not had time to count them.

Mr. CLAPP. I should like the attention of the Senate for a moment in this connection. The Senate passed a rule two or three years ago providing that pension bills, private claims bills, and other bills of that kind, may be filed with the clerks and recorded as introduced. The fact is, that either the rule has been forgotten or, in the case of those who may have come in since the rule was adopted, it has not been called to their attention, because every morning we go through the same ceremony of the introduction of bills and gain nothing by it, when most of them might be filed with the clerks, put in the RECORD, and credited to the Senator filing them.

By Mr. TALIAFERRO:

A bill (S. 2175) granting a pension to Mollie Brantley (with the accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2176) granting an increase of pension to Peter F. Pellicer (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2177) granting an increase of pension to Cassinovo Masters (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2178) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Masters (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A bill (S. 2179) to authorize and empower J. L. Hankinson, N. B. Dial, and their associates, successors, and assigns, to construct a dam; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A joint resolution (S. J. R. 27) granting condemned cannon for a statue to Gen. George A. Custer, of Michigan;

A joint resolution (S. J. R. 28) granting to the State of Michigan permission to use for its own purposes unused portions of condemned cannon granted to that State by joint resolution of June 23, 1906; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A joint resolution (S. J. R. 29) appropriating \$275,000 for immediate and necessary work on the harbor of refuge, Harbor Beach, Mich.;

A joint resolution (S. J. R. 30) providing for an examination and survey of White Lake Harbor, Michigan; and

A joint resolution (S. J. R. 31) directing an examination of Pigeon River, at Port Sheldon, Mich.; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. OLIVER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. GAMBLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BURTON submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

Mr. OWEN. I submit a resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 39) was read, as follows:

Senate resolution 39.

Resolved, That there be printed 6,000 copies of Report of the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children (S. Doc. 721, 60th Cong. 2d sess.), of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the conference.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma asks for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Senator if he has ascertained the cost of the printing?

Mr. OWEN. I was just going to state that I have ascertained the cost, and it is within the limit of \$500.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, notwithstanding that, it seems to me that the resolution ought to go to the Committee on Printing. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The motion was agreed to.

SUGAR IMPORTATIONS.

Mr. BRISTOW submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40); which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Senate resolution 40.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate—

First. The amount of raw sugar imported into the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, by each sugar refinery in the United States.

Second. The countries from which these refineries imported such raw sugar, the amount imported from each country, and the price at American port of the sugar imported from each country during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1438.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, my remarks will be brief, and I will kindly ask not to be interrupted. If any of my party colleagues should disagree with me in any statement that I may make, I will ask them to wait until I have finished, because I am almost sure that they will agree with me in the conclusions that I have reached.

I have risen mainly for one purpose, and that is to try and find out where I am in this bewildering confusion upon the subject before us. I want to locate myself, if possible, in this wild night of tumult and commotion, and see if there is any light upon the horizon that will lead me to an anchorage out of the gloom.

Where am I and what am I? These are the momentous problems that are surging in upon me. I have never had the slightest difficulty before in solving them. What is there in this perplexing hour to entangle me in uncertainty and doubt? The Senator from Rhode Island proclaimed the other day that our party had practically abandoned the principles for which it contended so hard not many years ago, and that it was no longer in favor of a tariff simply for revenue, but it had become a convert to the doctrine of a tariff for protection. I respectfully deny that statement, but even if it were so, simply speaking for myself, now, where do I stand? Am I in favor of a tariff for revenue with incidental protection or of a tariff for protection with incidental revenue? Am I a Democrat, for instance, on free hides and a Republican on groundnuts? Am I a protectionist on zinc ore and pig iron and a revenue reformer on citrons and pineapples?

And where do I stand when the faith of my fathers strikes the subject of raw materials? What has become of the epic poem that we chanted during the Cleveland administration of free wool and other kindred products? At that time the air was charged with these incantations, and if my memory is not in error an entire presidential message was devoted to these beautiful melodies. Now, what is a raw material? It appears that wool, for instance, is not a raw material at all. That has been demonstrated in recent debates upon the topic. Even sheep are not a raw material. They are a manufactured product. In a great oration that was lately delivered upon this theme a gentleman asks, "Are mules raw materials? Well, if mules are not raw materials why are sheep raw materials?" In a controversy that took place here a few weeks ago, and to which I have already referred in previous remarks, the Senator from West Virginia protested against New England taking his manufactured products and calling them raw materials.

I could not at that time understand why Massachusetts should deprecate upon the holdings of the Senator from West Virginia, because West Virginia had not at all invaded the possessions of the Senator from Massachusetts. Massachusetts is rich enough. Everybody is comfortable in Massachusetts except, perhaps, the operatives and laborers who make the profits for her factories and mills. It is entirely different in West Virginia. There are only a few people in West Virginia who have saved a few million dollars, say from fifteen to twenty million dollars apiece, and they are absolutely dependent upon their income for a living, and, all their investments being in raw materials, I thought at the time that it was a shame for the Senator from Massachusetts not only to take a place upon the committee himself, but practically to exclude the Senator from West Virginia from the committee, and in distributing the benefits of protection to deprive the Senator from West Virginia of his raw materials, upon which he is entirely dependent for a living. I am glad now that this controversy is on the eve of adjustment. I predicted that it would be, but I am more than gratified at the happy result. Massachusetts said to West Virginia, "We want free Nova Scotia coal," and West Virginia replied to Massachusetts, "We want cheaper Massachusetts shoes and woollens." "That will not do," said the Senators from Massachusetts, "because that is a violation of the New England doctrine of tariff reform, whose motto is 'The cheapest market in which to buy and the dearest market in which to sell.'"

Some of our friends thought when we heard the philippic of the Senator from West Virginia that he was arranging to come over to our side, and that there was a chance perhaps of nominating him for the next Democratic President upon a raw-material platform.

While he seemed to be in dead earnest, and while his invective was magnificent, I did not think at the time that it meant war. I felt that the Republican party, under the masterly leadership of the Senator from Rhode Island, would come to the conclusion that it is better to keep West Virginia in the Republican column than to give New England Canadian coal.

In this connection I want to avail myself of the opportunity to congratulate the Senator from Rhode Island upon the tremendous work that he has accomplished. I do not believe that in the whole history of tariff legislation such an amount of labor has ever devolved upon a single individual. There is not that man nor combination of men living who can frame a

tariff bill to suit the conflicting interests of the United States. That conflict is growing instead of diminishing, and what the commercial interests of this country demand now is a settlement of this harassing question.

We are in a condition now that is worse than a panic, because the business community is in a state of uncertainty and suspense that is detrimental to our prosperity, and without intimating that we are hastily to conclude this legislation, if we can intelligently accelerate it to a speedy determination I am sure that such action will meet with the unstinted approbation of our constituents. Without indulging in any violent denunciation, it is simply my purpose now to enter my protest against this bill, against substantially its entire framework and against the entire process and methods that underlie its construction.

The Senator from Rhode Island, in a brief discussion that took place a few weeks ago over the practice that obtained before the Finance Committee, boldly stated in this presence that a tariff for revenue and free trade were identically one and the same thing. This is the first time that I have ever heard the proposition thus announced. I have never come across a passage upon the pages of political economy; I have never heard a practical expert or statistician treat the subject from this standpoint. I have always considered that free trade between this country and other countries meant the abolition of custom-house duties, and, if I am permitted to say so, I think that the Senator confuses fair competition with free trade.

To tell me that a government that should propose upon a revenue basis to collect about \$300,000,000 a year by placing a duty upon about 4,000 articles of importation is a free-trade country is a proposition so startling that it is impossible to comprehend it. The Senator, who is always courteous and kind in his intercourse with every Member of this body, although he has had enough to make him irritable and disagreeable for the balance of his life, in the performance of this work that has so largely devolved upon him, complimented me the other day in saying that he thought I was capable of framing a tariff bill. I beg to differ with him. I tried it once. In one of my hotly contested congressional campaigns a well-intentioned friend of mine approached me and said he thought that I knew all about the tariff and that I certainly would be successful if I wrote a book upon it and distributed it through my district. In an evil hour I took his advice. I wrote the book, and it was well distributed. It was a fine work. There was a great demand for this book. It was a work of 160 pages. I was defeated just 160 votes [laughter], and I have always thought that if the book had been a thousand pages I might have been defeated a thousand votes. [Laughter.] My district at that time was evidently a protection district. This has been over twenty years ago, and I have never published a second edition of this work. It is therefore with some degree of diffidence that I even venture to make any suggestions upon this exasperating subject.

What annoys me now worse than anything else is that for years and years I have studied the perplexing details of these bewildering schedules. I accumulated volume after volume in every living language and from every author, either dead or living, upon the captivating theme of the tariff, because I then had the idea that every youthful and ambitious tariff reformer has—that Providence had endowed me with the special faculty of once and forever settling this mighty question. I was encouraged in this belief because, under the Cleveland administration, I was associated in the House of Representatives with a body of tariff reformers who were, each of them, respectively, possessed of the same conceit and laboring under the same delusion. We passed a bill. The Senator from Rhode Island knows what became of it. The Senator will recall it, because he was in the fire of that fight, and when the bill came back from the Senate it was like the counterfeit presentment of two brothers, resembling our beneficent measure about as much as this bill resembles its progenitor in the House of Representatives, and about as much as the conference bill will resemble either of these bills.

Notwithstanding all these retarding experiences which I have had, I must summon up the courage to again venture a few suggestions, and that is all at this present moment, in reference to this bill which have passed through my mind as I have studied its provisions. I do not propose now to enter upon any particular schedule. I shall do that hereafter. The moment you do that you lose sight, to some extent, of the principles that are involved. It is time enough to enter upon such a discussion when the various schedules are reached. A particular schedule is largely a matter of justice or injustice in the dis-

tribution of protection, and does not reach, to my mind, the fundamental proposition that is involved in the entire construction of this bill.

I am not criticising anyone at all in any views that he may entertain upon this bill. Everyone is entitled to his own judgment, and as we are all equally honest about it, it might be just as well for each of us, respectively, to announce his own opinion without commenting upon those who differ with him. I have not the slightest fault to find with anyone who may disagree with me. He may be right and I may be wrong. I would be an arrant coward, however, if I stood here and hesitated honestly and conscientiously to give expression to my thoughts upon this subject.

The Senator from Rhode Island, although he said it, as is always his custom, in the most urbane and courtly manner, did not terrify me the other day when he hurled against me the time-worn and tawdry epithet of "free trade." There have been free traders in this country and plenty of them. Frank Hurd, one of the most eloquent men who ever made his entry into the House of Representatives, was an out-and-out free trader. I have never believed in free trade between this country and other countries. I think from every practical standpoint it is perfectly preposterous to talk about it. I think the country would vote such a proposition down almost with practical unanimity. I believe in custom-house taxation, and I do not believe any other system will ever take its place to the satisfaction of the American people. Free trade is not the question before us, and no amount of reproach and adjectives will deter me from stating what the question really is. If there were a resolution now boldly before the Senate in favor of the entire abolition of tariff duties, I do not believe that the doctrine of free trade would receive a single vote upon our side of the Chamber. Let me now read, in this connection, several extracts, very brief, from Democratic platforms, upon one of which Mr. Tilden was nominated for President, and upon the other of which Mr. Cleveland was nominated. I only want to refresh my memory now with these declarations of party policy so as to find out exactly where I am, as I said in the beginning of these remarks.

In 1876 the platform upon which Mr. Tilden was nominated declared:

We denounce the present tariff, levied upon nearly 4,000 articles, as a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretense.

We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue.

In 1892 the platform upon which Mr. Cleveland was nominated proclaimed:

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud—a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue only.

As I understood at that time, these tariff planks were written, respectively, by the Democratic leaders whose names I have mentioned, and they embody, in my judgment, our party axiom, and that is that we have no constitutional power to collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue. That has been the battle cry of Democracy for over a quarter of a century. During the half of a century we have twice elected a Democratic President upon a platform that planted itself upon this cardinal principle of our institutions. We have never yet trailed our banner in the dust that bore the party emblem of a constitutional tariff for revenue, and, as the junior Senator from Texas proclaimed the other day, if we were in power we would undoubtedly put that doctrine into practical execution. If we abandon that issue now, I can not see what other issue there is between the parties. Of course, Mr. President, if we are wrong, let us abandon it; if with industrial development we have concluded that it is best now to change the traditions of our faith and levy a tariff for protection, let us say so. I shall find no fault with those who have arrived at this conclusion. *Tempora mutantur et cum illis mutamus.*

This brings me, Mr. President, to my objections to the present bill, and I shall state them concisely. In the first place, it being a bill to provide revenue, it fails to provide it. It is entitled "A bill to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes." If the title has anything to do with the subject-matter, it ought to be entitled "A bill to encourage the industries of the United States, and for no other purpose."

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives has stated that the deficit for the fiscal year 1909 will be in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000. You can study this bill by night and by day, and it is utterly impossible under this bill to make up this deficit, even if you deduct from this amount the sums that come under the head of "Permanent appropriations"—the fund for the redemption of national-bank notes and the sinking-fund provision. Tak-

ing a normal year as a basis, I doubt very much whether it will add any appreciable amount to our present collections. In all of the arguments and presentations that have been made upon the subject I have discovered no estimate, except guesswork and conjecture, that pretends to cover this amount. I have examined it carefully by comparison in this respect with the best help that I can procure upon the subject, and it is impossible for me to arrive at the results reached by the Senator from Rhode Island by any figuring or computation that I can make. With what light, therefore, that I can gather, I pronounce this bill to be an utter failure in so far as providing the necessary amount of revenue is concerned.

This brings me to the next objection, and that is that it does not provide the additional revenue simply because its main object is to furnish protection and not revenue. The whole framework of the bill is protection first and revenue afterwards, and with great deference to the Senator from Rhode Island and the committee, I think that it would have been far better to have allowed the matter to stand as it was upon the Dingley bill without attempting any revision at all. Of course the revision was promised, and some sort of a revision had to be made, and you will understand me that I do not criticise or censure the Republican party for making the attempt at least to fulfill its political obligations, but if such a promise had never been made, then, in my judgment, it would have been far better for the consuming public of America if no tariff legislation had been attempted at this session and the Dingley bill had stood intact in all of its provisions, as much as I am opposed to it.

Now, our proposition would be, if we had the power to exercise it, to frame a bill for revenue, which is the very opposite of this bill, because this bill is formulated upon the principle of protection, with incidental revenue, if you can possibly get it. Protection, and not revenue, runs through every paragraph and bracket of this measure. It was an easy task to supply revenue if you left protection for the time out of consideration. It becomes a task utterly impossible of accomplishment if, with almost every schedule outside of the free list, protection and not revenue is the objective point.

Now, the question will be asked, How could the necessary revenues have been obtained without destroying, or at least impairing, American industries? I will answer that by saying that if I had a hand in the framing of a tariff bill I would be guided by the following process: Summoning to my aid the best practical experts that I could procure, I would take the schedules and divide and apportion them in this manner: I would separate the schedules into four divisions; in the first place, I would take the necessities of life and place them in a separate column; in the next place, I would take the luxuries and do likewise; in the next place, I would take the lawful industries and enterprises that are represented in the list; and in the last column I would place the monopolies that are practically controlling the American output and are commanding their own prices in the American market. I would levy the lowest tax possible upon the necessities of life and the highest tax possible upon the luxuries, and I would make reductions so as to maintain at all times the standard of American wages. Mr. Cleveland wrote into the platform of 1884 these words upon this particular detail, and they can not be improved upon:

From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of federal revenue. Such they must continue to be.

The necessary reduction and taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country.

Throughout the whole of the bill I would look out for the consumer. You may examine this bill, outside of the free list, and it is almost impossible to discover the consumer in any of its complicated schedules.

Analyze Schedule B and see how protection will continue to maintain its excessive prices in the furnishing and equipping of every home in the country, and then when you come to Schedule C, from iron ore up, look at what perfectly trifling changes have been made in these oppressive duties. In Schedule I a change was made from the Payne bill back again to the Dingley bill, and that only after a united protest and clamor arose from the consuming public against the iniquity of increased duties upon articles of necessary consumption. In Schedule J, in its principal provisions, instead of reducing duties they have been raised, to give unreasonable profits to a few manufacturers grouped together principally in a single State of the Union. Schedule K is an insult, as it has always been to the American people, and challenges their right to live except with the permission of the interests that have dictated their own excessive figures, and all through the unclassified sections of Schedule N we look in vain for any

relief from this system of ravenous rapacity that does not seem willing to leave open a single avenue of escape from its penalties and inflictions.

It is true that the bill makes reductions, but in the large number of reductions the duty is either still prohibitive or sufficiently protective so as to confer no benefit upon the consumer whatever. This is where the ingenuity that was at work in the composition of the bill becomes apparent. I will not use the words "artifice" or "design," because I want to be conservative in any statements that I make; but I do say this, that both in the Payne bill and in this bill, upon a critical analysis, you can easily discern the delicate touch of a fine Italian hand, or, rather, two hands, one of them reducing duties and the other still keeping them up to such a figure that the reduction will be of no actual benefit to the American consumer. That constitutes the genius of the bill. It was a difficult task to perform, to reduce duties and still not to reduce them; but God seems to have given the Republican party the brains to perform this paradoxical maneuver. Under the magic touch of the architects of this bill the American consumer will have exhibited before him a large number of reductions in the tariff, and he will be delighted pro tanto, and the industries that are furnishing the articles upon which the duties are reduced will at the same time fully realize that the reduction still enables them to command their own prices, and they will be more than delighted.

I make this prediction: That the bill will not, and it does not, in any substantial degree lower prices to the consumer; and I make another prediction, and that is that this bill will not in any substantial degree affect the inordinate profits that the protected industries are now receiving through custom-house taxation. I congratulate the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate and their colleagues and the Republican party, and particularly the American Protective Tariff League, that they have carried out their promise in revising the tariff to suit themselves and that the American people have again been fooled, and that they will be fooled to all eternity until and unless this whole subject of federal taxation is rescued from the contaminating touch of politics and these great combinations of fabulous dimensions that to-day practically own the Government of the United States are told that the hour has come when they must dissolve and retire and make way for the people, so that legitimate American enterprise, upon the broad avenues of competition, can resume its time-honored vocation and reassert its ancient rights.

Mr. President, I am not a demagogue. I hate a demagogue. I could not be one if I wanted to. I am the friend, the ardent friend, of every lawful business enterprise in this land. My colleague and myself represent not only a farming and agricultural constituency and a constituency of intelligent mechanics and laboring men, but we represent a great city whose heart is throbbing with activity and enterprise, a metropolis with as fine facilities as any on the globe and with a line of merchants and manufacturers whose unbroken record of honor and integrity has made our business establishments and great banking and counting-houses famous at every commercial center of the world. From time immemorial we have borne this reputation, ever since the Baltimore clippers sailed the sea, the pride and the glory of the American merchant marine, until this day, when upon the bosom of our waters there is transported and imported from almost every land and clime the commerce of mankind. In the closing observations, therefore, that I am now about to make, it will be understood that I intend no reference to any lawful business pursuit conducted anywhere within the broad domain of this land. Upon a careful examination of this bill, I now assert that I can not find within any of its provisions any change that will relieve us from the exactions and oppressive tribute that have been levied upon the American people by the combinations of centralized wealth that are known under the name of "trusts."

This word "trust" is a misnomer. It means nothing, but as it conveys a certain idea to the public mind in our vernacular, I shall use it for want of a better phrase. If these combinations were a benefit to the country, I would favor the immediate withdrawal of all opposition to them and would give them the broadest latitude within which to extend their operations. If by combining the resources of capital they lowered the prices of consumption; if by creating new enterprises they enlarged the field of employment; if they increased the wages of labor; if they contributed in any manner to the prosperity or welfare of the country, I would let them advance with steady step and plant their acquisitions in every Commonwealth over the undisputed territory of the Union. But they do no one of these things. They raise prices, they limit production, they lower wages, they contract the demand for labor, they throttle competition, they

monopolize the wealth of the land, they withdraw it from the channels of circulation, and when they are driven from one State they obtain their franchises in another and then return with insolence to pursue their calling in the place from which they are banished. I can look around in my own State and observe that whenever a new enterprise is started that comes in conflict with them they sweep down upon it as the cormorant does upon his prey, and that their rapacity is never appeased so long as a spark of vitality is left in any competitor that crosses their path.

I do not find within this bill a line or a sentence that weakens their grasp upon the commerce of the country. On the contrary, they show their hateful front in almost every schedule of this bill, principally in Schedule B, the glassware schedule; under the subtitle of "Manufactures of iron and steel," in the metal schedule; in the wool and woolen duties under Schedule K; in the flax, hemp, and jute schedule; in the sugar and oil schedules; and in the general provisions of the bill in the duties imposed upon the implements of husbandry and the utensils of the farm.

As against them, if I had the opportunity in the framing of a tariff bill I would open the ports of entry of this Republic. I would bring them in competition with the markets of the world. It is said that if we do this, we will interfere with other industries that are competing with them. There is hardly a word of truth in that statement, because they tolerate no rivalry and permit no interference.

One of the greatest blessings that could be conferred upon this country would take place if they could be made to resolve themselves into their constituent and component parts.

They have raised prices to such an inordinate figure that it is almost impossible for persons in moderate circumstances to procure the comforts of life; worse than this, they have deteriorated the products and supplies that they sell and have imposed upon the public articles of inferior grade and quality, and laying the whole country under tribute to their exactions and extortions, I think I voice the sentiment of the country when I say that I would follow them from schedule to schedule, and, as against them, would open up the highways of the ocean to the commerce of mankind.

The law does not seem to reach them, and I am frank to confess that I would like to see a tariff bill so constructed in its primary purpose that whenever their particular schedules are reached the duties should be so reduced that they would no longer be able to bankrupt and crush individual enterprise, and would no longer be able to dictate in commanding terms the price of almost every article of absolute necessity at the home and fireside of the American consumer, so that, compelled through free and fair competition to unclasp the fetters that enslave American commerce, the rights of their victims would thus be recognized, and the American people would be liberated and disenthralled.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate for a short time this morning to discuss briefly some of the features of the lumber schedule of the pending bill; and, in order that I may not occupy too much of the time of the Senate, I shall be glad if I be not interrupted until the close of my remarks. Senators who have served with me here know that I do not generally object to interruptions and can, as a rule, take care of myself. So it is not on account of any fear of interruptions that I now ask this indulgence of the Senate, but rather to save time.

Mr. President, in order to know where we stand on this lumber schedule, I desire, first, to call attention to some preliminary matters. First as to paragraph 196, relating to square timber, etc., there is an apparent reduction of 50 per cent. The duty is apparently reduced from 1 cent per cubic foot to half a cent per cubic foot; but on examination it will be found to be nominal and rather an increase than a reduction in rate. When this tariff bill first saw the light in the other body it had in it what have been termed two or three "jokers." In reference to a tariff bill, I understand a "joker" to be where a provision on one hand professes to give a reduction and on the other hand undermines and destroys that reduction. I might say, before I proceed, that one of the greatest of these jokers was finally eliminated from the bill in the House. I refer to that part of the bill which contained the proviso in the provision reducing the tariff on sawed lumber from \$2 a thousand to \$1 a thousand, in paragraph 197. That proviso, had it not been eliminated, would have rendered the apparent reduction entirely nugatory. But there are two other minor jokers in the bill; and I want to call the attention of the Senate to these. The first one is in paragraph 196. That paragraph in the bill reads:

Timber hewn, sided, or squared, otherwise than by sawing (not less than 8 inches square), and round timber used for spars or in building wharves, one-half of 1 cent per cubic foot.

There is injected into this provision the words:

Otherwise than by sawing—

Not found in the Dingley law of 1897.

The phrase "otherwise than by sawing" practically eliminates all squared timber from paragraph 196 for, as a matter of fact, all the squared timber which is used in this country is sawed timber. I know of no case in my section of the country where anybody uses hewn squared timber, except in the case of a small farmer, where he has a bit of oak timber on his land and wants to build a barn or something of that kind, he may go out into the woods and hew some sills; otherwise all squared timber—I might say over 99 per cent of the squared timber of the country—is sawed timber.

What is the effect of injecting into this paragraph the words "otherwise than by sawing?" The effect is practically to put all sawed square timber in the class of "sawed lumber not specially provided for, and so forth," in paragraph 197, where it would be subject to a duty of \$1 per thousand feet board measure.

A cubic foot of squared timber contains 12 feet board measure. At \$1 a thousand that amounts to 1 cent and 2 mills; in other words, while the Dingley law placed a duty of 1 cent a cubic foot on squared timber and while the bill as it comes here professes to reduce it to one-half a cent, yet by putting those words in that paragraph the duty is made higher than it is under the Dingley Act, practically making the duty on squared timber 1 cent and 2 mills per cubic foot, an increase of 2 mills over the Dingley law. Senators can figure it out for themselves and can ascertain that the figures I have stated are absolutely correct.

There is to my mind another "joker" in the bill, in paragraph 212, to which I want to call your attention.

The first part of this paragraph reads as follows:

"Any wood or articles or forms of wood, except those provided for in paragraphs two hundred and six to two hundred and eleven, inclusive, of this section, shall, if subject to duty, pay five per centum ad valorem in addition to such duty, —."

"squared timber," "sawed boards," and "sawed lumber" are "articles or forms of wood," and are not in the excepted paragraphs, and are "subject to duty," hence are liable to "pay five per centum ad valorem in addition to such duty."

In other words, you have a cumulative duty of 5 per cent in addition to the duties in paragraphs 196 and 197. The residue of that paragraph, which is as follows, does not apply:

"and shall, if otherwise free of duty, pay a duty of five per centum ad valorem, whenever any such wood or articles or forms of wood are painted, polished, grained, stained, printed, or creosoted, or prepared or treated for fireproofing or waterproofing."

The cumulative duty of 5 per cent in the first part of paragraph 212 added to the duty in paragraphs 196 and 197 would nearly double the duties in the present bill on "squared timber," "sawed boards," and "sawed lumber," etc.

There are other provisions of this bill in reference to cumulative duties in other schedules to which I shall later call the attention of the Senate. I shall now confine myself to the lumber schedule. What are the present rates on lumber, and what are the rates proposed by the pending bill? I have already explained the present and proposed rates under paragraph 196, so shall confine myself to the classes and rates in paragraph 197. Under this paragraph the rate on unfinished "sawed boards, and so forth," is reduced from \$1 to 50 cents per thousand, with the 5 per cent "joker" attached to which I have already referred, and on "sawed and unfinished lumber, and so forth," from \$2 to \$1 per thousand. The differential or cumulative duties of the Dingley law on planed and grooved boards and lumber are retained. The duties on planed and matched "boards," under the Dingley law and this bill, are as follows, per thousand:

	Under Dingley law.	Under bill H. R. 1438.
Boards planed one side.....	\$1.50	\$1.00
Boards planed two sides.....	2.00	1.50
Boards planed three sides.....	2.50	2.00
Boards planed four sides.....	3.00	2.50
Boards planed one side and grooved.....	2.00	1.50
Boards planed two sides and grooved.....	2.50	2.00
And on sawed lumber, etc., as follows:		
Sawed lumber planed one side.....	2.50	1.50
Sawed lumber planed two sides.....	3.00	2.00
Sawed lumber planed three sides.....	3.50	2.50
Sawed lumber planed four sides.....	4.00	3.00
Sawed lumber planed one side and grooved.....	3.00	2.00
Sawed lumber planed two sides and grooved.....	3.50	2.50

Over 90 per cent of the boards and lumber sold and used is planed or dressed lumber, usually dressed on two sides and often on three and four sides. In fact, in many places it is impossible to buy or secure undressed and unplaned lumber, and, of course, ceiling, flooring, and drop siding are always not only planed, but also grooved or matched.

I shall show later on, Mr. President, that the cost of planing and grooving lumber does not as a rule in well-equipped modern mills exceed 50 cents per thousand, and in none of them over 60 cents per thousand, and that the railway freight on a thousand feet of planed and dressed lumber is 15 per cent less than on the rough and unplaned lumber, and this explains why the lumbermen as a rule only ship planed and dressed lumber.

Mr. President, since my brief remarks the other day some Senators on this side have privately taken me to task and said that I am a free trader. Well, I do not mind that insinuation coming from an obdurate "standpatter." As expressive of my sentiment and as a warrant for my attitude with respect to this subject, I beg leave to quote as a text the following portions of the remarks of President Taft on December 16, 1908, in a speech delivered in New York. This is what President Taft said:

I believe that the way to stamp out trusts and monopolies is to avoid excessive rates which tempt monopolies. It would be better to have no revision at all unless we are going honestly and fairly to revise the tariff on the basis promised by our party.

Mr. President, for several years the people of the great Northwest—the upper Mississippi Valley—the very heart of this continent, have been looking forward to a revision of the tariff; and whenever they referred to a revision of the tariff, they meant a revision downward and never a revision upward. What endeared Mr. Taft to the people of the Northwest, what made him so strong among our people, was the fact that even a year before he received the nomination for President, in a speech he made somewhere in the East—I do not now recall the place—he came out squarely in favor of a revision and a reduction of the tariff. Our people in the Northwest accepted that as his gospel, and that fact, more than anything else, made Mr. Taft near and dear to the people of the upper Mississippi Valley.

Mr. President, my objection to the duties levied upon lumber rests upon the fundamental fact that it is fostering and building up one of the greatest and worst monopolies in this country. We have heard much of the Standard Oil monopoly, how it has reached out and frozen out all its competitors in this country. So it has. By unjust rebates and discriminations it has succeeded in acquiring practically a monopoly of the oil industry. But this much can be said to the credit of that great monopoly, that it has from time to time made reductions in the price of its products.

How has it been with this great timber combination which practically controls the lumber supply of this country? It is estimated—and I think it is somewhere near correct—that about 20 per cent of all the available timber supply is now in forest reserves. Pretty much all the timber of any merchantable value that the Government owns is now in forest reserves, and as a result of that all the balance of the timber supply is in the hands of private owners, and it has gravitated into the hands of great monopolies. A comparatively small number of men control the timber supply of the country. We in the Northwest know something about it. When the lumbermen in Michigan and Wisconsin and Minnesota had to a large extent despoiled the forests of those States and denuded them, destroyed the supply of timber practically, except in Minnesota, they went out to the West and to the South and secured immense holdings of timber. In Minnesota there are three or four leading firms which control millions of acres on the Pacific coast. The Weyerhaeuser syndicate, with all its numerous subsidiary and affiliated corporations, to which Mr. Hines, president of the American Lumber Association, belongs, and who has been here laboring for a high tariff on lumber. The Weyerhaeuser syndicate has secured a large body of fine timber on the Pacific coast—upward of 2,000,000 acres of some of the best timber land on the Pacific coast. Then there is Mr. Walker, of Minnesota, who has secured in the neighborhood of 600,000 acres of the finest timber land in California, known as western pine. Then there is the firm of C. A. Smith & Co., of Minnesota, which has secured another large body of timber on the Pacific coast, also the firm of Shevlin & Co., and a number of other large firms from Wisconsin, Michigan, and other points have secured large bodies of timber land on the Pacific coast, so that these comparatively few syndicates and firms practically have a monopoly of the stumpage in that western country. They own or control upward of 4,000,000 acres of valuable timber lands in that section, and it is esti-

mated by Mr. Hines that most of that land will run from twenty to fifty thousand feet board measure to the acre (see House hearings, p. 2945). How did they acquire it and at what cost? Weyerhaeuser acquired over a million acres in one lump from the Northern Pacific Railway Company at an average of 15 cents a thousand. The other concerns acquired most of their holdings at an equally low rate.

A large portion of the land Mr. Walker owns and controls he acquired by so-called forest reserve scrip, costing from \$5 to \$6 an acre; and a large portion he acquired by transfers from stone and timber entrymen—who paid the Government \$2.50 per acre, and whose title he acquired at an average cost of not exceeding \$5 per acre—so that his stumpage on the average did not cost him to exceed 15 cents per thousand feet. Nearly all of his holdings he acquired under these two methods. As with Weyerhaeuser and Walker, so with the other syndicates, corporations, and concerns. They all acquired most of their holdings in the same way as Mr. Walker and their stumpage stands them at the same low figure. These big syndicates to which I have referred own or control more than half of the timber supply on the Pacific coast not included in Government forest reserves—and they have picked out the best timber, too. Now this is not all. These great lumbermen have not only gone there and monopolized the stumpage of the Pacific coast, but they have gone into the Southern States. These same gentlemen control the bulk of the yellow pine in the South. The House hearings show this. How have they treated the American people, after getting control of all this timber, north, west and south—after getting control practically of the timber supply of the country? From 1898, the year following the enactment of the Dingley tariff law, up to 1907, they more than quadrupled the price of their stumpage, and more than doubled the price of lumber. House Hearings, Schedule D, show these facts. The price of lumber during this period increased on most grades over 100 per cent, and on some grades as high as 150 per cent. I have here a bulletin issued by the Census Office. It was printed in 1908. It gives the lumber cut for 1907. The title of it is "Forest Products, No. 2. The Lumber Cut of the United States, 1907. Compiled in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture: Forest Service." I have examined this pamphlet, and I want to call your attention to what it shows. Of the various classes of lumber I have segregated seven of the highest classes which together constitute over 80 per cent of the total cut of lumber in the country for 1907. In 1907 the total cut was 40,256,154,000 feet. Let me read the figures of the total cut of these seven classes, and the prices. Yellow pine is at the head of the list. The total cut of this class in 1906 was 11,661,077,000 feet. In 1907, 13,215,185,000 feet. Now what are the prices? I quote the mill prices from the report at the price per thousand feet, board measure. The price of this class of lumber in 1900 was \$8.51 a thousand; in 1904, \$10.10; in 1906, \$13.02; and in 1907, \$14.02, an increase from 1900 up to 1907 of the difference between \$8.51 and \$14.02 a thousand.

The next great class of lumber is what is known as the Douglas fir, the chief timber of the Pacific coast. The total cut in 1906 was 4,969,843,000 feet. In 1907 it was 4,748,872,000. The price at the mill in 1900 was \$8.67 a thousand; in 1904, \$9.51; in 1906, \$14.20; and in 1907, \$14.12 per thousand. So that this class of lumber has gone up from \$8.67 a thousand since 1900 to \$14.12 a thousand in 1907.

The next great class of lumber is white pine. The total cut in 1906 was 4,583,727,000; in 1907, 4,192,708,000. The supply is diminishing.

The average mill price of white-pine lumber in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota was, in 1900, \$12.69 per thousand. In 1904, \$14.93; in 1906, \$18.32; and in 1907, \$19.41. These figures are the average prices—the general average of mill prices.

The next great class of lumber is oak. The total cut in 1906 was 2,820,393,000 feet. In 1907 it was 3,718,760,000 feet. The price at the mill in 1900 was \$13.78 a thousand; in 1904, \$17.50; in 1906, \$21.76; and in 1907, \$21.23. Thus it appears that oak lumber advanced from \$13.78 a thousand in 1900 to \$21.23 a thousand feet in 1907.

Hemlock is the next great class of lumber. The total cut in 1906 was 3,537,329,000 feet and in 1907 3,373,016,000. The average mill price per thousand was, in 1900, \$9.98; in 1904, \$11.91; in 1906, \$15.31; and in 1907, \$15.53.

The next great class is spruce. The total cut in 1906 was 1,644,987,000; in 1907, 1,726,797,000. The average mill price per thousand of this lumber was, in 1900, \$11.27; in 1904, \$14.03; in 1906, \$17.33; and in 1907, \$17.26.

The next and final class of the seven referred to is western pine—the so-called sugar pine of California. The cut of this in 1906 was 1,386,777,000; in 1907, 1,527,195,000 feet. The average

mill price was, in 1900, \$9.70; in 1904, \$11.29; in 1906, \$14.01; and in 1907, \$15.76.

Taking all these seven groups that I have named, the cut or output in 1907 amounts to 32,502,533,000 feet out of an aggregate cut of all kinds of 40,256,154,000, or 80 per cent. I have compiled all these figures from the report and will recapitulate them. Yellow pine in 1900, \$8.51 per thousand; in 1907, \$14.02 per thousand, an increase of 65 per cent. Douglas fir in 1900, \$8.67 per thousand; in 1907, \$14.12 per thousand, an increase of 63 per cent.

Mr. PILES. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will let me interrupt him right here, because his speech really carries a false impression. The lumber which sold for \$14.20 in 1906 and 1907 is now selling for \$8.

Mr. NELSON. I am not referring to that now, and the prices since the panic have no bearing on what transpired before.

White pine, in 1900, was \$12.69 a thousand; in 1907, \$19.41, an increase of 53 per cent. Oak lumber increased from \$13.78 to \$21.23, an increase of 54 per cent. Hemlock from \$9.98 to \$15.53, an increase of 55 per cent. Spruce from \$11.27 in 1900 to \$17.26 in 1907, an increase of 53 per cent. Western pine, that is the California pine, in 1900 sold at \$9.76; in 1907, at \$15.76. Taking these seven classes that I have recapitulated, the average of them is as follows: The average price in 1900 was \$10.66 a thousand; and in 1907, \$16.74 a thousand, an increase of over 57 per cent in those years—from 1900 to 1907.

I have looked over the tables of wages contained in the report of the House hearings, and compared the increase of wages as given there from 1900 to 1906, the year of highest wages in the white-pine region of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and find the increase in wages of mill men about 20 per cent, and of men in the woods about 11.6 per cent, or an average for both classes of about 16 per cent, as appears from the following table taken from the House hearings.

WHITE PINE.

Average price at mill per M, 1900, \$12.69; average price at mill per M, 1907, \$19.41. Increase, \$6.72=53 per cent.
Increase in wages from 1900 to 1907, 16 per cent.

Comparative average wages paid by pine sawmills of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan.

[Sawmill employees, day rate.]

	1895.	1898.	a 1900.	1902.	1904.	b 1906.	1908.
Foremen	\$3.19	\$3.85	\$4.50	\$5.00	\$6.00	\$7.00	\$6.50
Millwrights	2.55	2.88	3.50	3.75	3.80	4.00	3.25
Engineers	2.55	2.80	3.50	3.50	4.00	4.50	4.00
Sawyers	3.50	4.50	5.25	5.50	6.00	6.50	6.00
Setters	2.25	2.50	2.75	2.80	2.85	2.90	2.75
Edger men	2.25	2.50	2.75	2.80	2.85	2.90	2.75
Trimmer men	2.00	2.50	2.60	2.60	2.75	2.80	2.50
Graders	2.25	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.25	3.25	2.50
Tallymen	2.00	2.25	2.25	2.40	2.50	2.60	2.25
Pilers	1.55	1.75	1.90	2.00	2.15	2.25	2.15
Blacksmiths	2.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.25	2.75
Laborers	1.25	1.75	1.80	1.85	1.90	2.00	1.75
Sorters	1.50	1.80	1.90	2.00	2.25	2.50	1.95
Boon men	1.50	1.65	2.00	2.15	2.25	2.50	2.25

^a Average for year 1900, \$2.90.

^b Average for year 1906, \$3.49=20½ per cent increase.

Wages paid for woods work in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

[Monthly wage, including board.]

	1896.	1898.	1899.	a 1900.	1901.	1902-4.	b 1906-7.	1907-8.
Teamsters	\$16	\$20	\$24	\$26	\$30	\$35	\$38	\$30
Swampers	13	20	24	25	30	30	40	35
Choppers	14	20	24	26	30	30	40	35
Loaders	20	26	30	32	35	35	40	35
Sawyers	14	20	24	26	30	32	35	32
Graders	13	18	20	24	30	30	25	30
Chain tenders	16	18	20	24	30	30	35	25
Blacksmiths	35	45	50	55	60	60	65	55
Cooks	40	45	50	55	65	65	70	50

Average increase of wages in mill and woods about 16 per cent.

^a Average for year 1900, \$32.55.

^b Average for years 1906-7, \$36.33=11.3 per cent increase.

This shows as I have stated that the average increase in wages for mill men during that period was a trifle over 20 per cent, and of the men in the woods a trifle over 11 per cent; not quite 12 per cent. Taking the two together, the average of the mill men and the average of the loggers, we find the increase on the average was about 16 per cent in the white-pine industry during that period. In Bulletin 77 of the Forestry Bureau they do not claim that the increase has been over from 20 to 25 per cent, as I recall it.

I have referred to these figures for the purpose of showing that while wages have increased in round numbers about 16 per cent for all classes of labor, or, if you please, 20 per cent, which is a liberal estimate, the prices of lumber within this period—from 1900 to 1907—have increased and advanced over 57 per cent. If we go back to 1898, the year following the enactment of the Dingley law, we find that from that year up to 1907 the average rates on lumber have increased over 100 per cent; in many instances up to 150 per cent.

What is true of lumber is in a measure true of shingles. The same bulletin from which I have quoted shows that the average price of shingles of all kinds in 1900 was \$1.56 a thousand. This is the mill price, Mr. President. In 1906 it was \$2.04 a thousand, in 1907 \$2.55 a thousand, and shingles are to some extent a by-product. And what is true of shingles is also true of laths. The same bulletin shows that while the cost of laths in 1900—and that is wholly a by-product, the refuse you may say—was \$1.86 a thousand, in 1907 it had advanced to \$2.85 a thousand, an increase of a trifle under a dollar a thousand.

These prices I have quoted are the mill prices. I further desire to call attention to the fact, with which we were all conversant in the Northwest, that the lumbermen had been so increasing the prices of lumber from 1898 to 1907—they had raised them so abnormally and outrageously high that even before the panic came on, in the fall of 1907, the lumber industry had become stagnant, because of overproduction and because of the excessive prices charged. This was apparent in the spring and summer of 1907. I know the farmers of Minnesota had begun to stint themselves in every way in consequence of the high prices. If a farmer had a bit of large poplar, or oak, or cherry, or any other kind of large timber on his farm which under ordinary conditions he never thought of making into lumber, he would cut down the trees, take the traction engine of his thrashing machine and a small portable sawmill into the woods and saw his own lumber from his own trees, and if he had any surplus lumber would sell it to his neighbor at reasonable rates, and thus many of them sought to evade the lumber trust. They say there is no lumber trust. Mr. President, we can not show that they have any written agreement among themselves, but we who are the consumers of lumber know that whether you seek to deal with one or another it is all the same. There is no difference in prices. They held them up as steady as the steel trust did before the panic.

A good deal is said about the difference in wages here and in Canada. What are the facts in respect of wages? Along the boundary line the loggers and millmen travel back and forth to work on whichever side they can get employment at the best wages, wholly governed by the law of supply and demand. Our lumber workers go into Canada from Minnesota and come back from Canada. The prices are practically the same. When the Canadians need our men they pay a little more, and when we need theirs we pay a little more. The prices are practically the same all throughout the country, with the exception, perhaps, of New England. In New England conditions are different. They have a different class of labor in Canada from that of Maine; but even there the law of supply and demand will no doubt govern in the lumber industry as in the wool and cotton factories.

New England gets its great supply of factory labor in the cotton and wool industry from Canada. If prices are higher in New England than in Canada the laborers will go to New England.

The expenses of logging on the Pacific coast, in Washington, it is claimed, are higher than in British Columbia. This is not so; the conditions in the woods and the cost of labor are practically the same. I have one witness here on that subject whose testimony, to my mind, is perfectly decisive on this point. I refer to Mr. Lamb. I read from the hearings in the House of Representatives, pp. 2980 and 2981. Mr. Lamb, of Washington, appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means in the interest of the retention of the present duties on lumber. He states, among other things:

I have come 3,000 miles, apparently to be sheared, and I am willing to take the medicine. I represent the Lamb Timber Company and the Washington Logging Brokerage Company. Both of those companies are engaged in logging. * * * Some ten years ago I took up a timber claim, etc. * * * Since then I have gone into logging work * * *. On the Pacific coast logging is an entirely separate industry from sawmilling * * *. Therefore I know nothing regarding lumber, etc.

Now, what does Mr. Lamb say on the question of wages? I read from page 2981 of the hearings:

The question of wages as an item of logging cost has been gone into very fully, but I simply wish to state that, in my opinion, the difference in cost of wages between British Columbia and Washington is very small. For a good many positions we pay the same wages. For railroad construction and the cheaper labor it is possible for the British Columbians to employ alien or foreign labor, which we can not do. The cost of supplies in British Columbia—machinery and tools—

as has been stated here, is somewhat higher on certain articles, as I happen to know, as I am manufacturing them for the British Columbia market. On the other supplies, such as wire rope, railroad material, etc., the British Columbians can buy cheaper than we can. So that, on the whole—

I want to call the attention of Senators to this—

So that, on the whole, so far as regards the actual cost of labor, there is very little difference.

Here we have the testimony of a man who came before the committee in favor of the retention of the present duty—a logger, a man engaged in the business of logging in the State of Washington—and who stated expressly before the committee in his sworn testimony that the cost of logging in the State of Washington was practically no higher than in British Columbia.

In this connection I will also read another statement, and call the attention of the Senate to the testimony of Mr. Lynch in these hearings, pages 2881, 2882, 2883, and 2884:

I am not well enough posted on lumber conditions on this side of the line to give much information concerning the cost of lumber here. I can tell you a good deal of the cost of production, the cost of stumpage, the cost of erecting sawmills and of operating them, and the price of labor on the other side of the line. I am now, and have been for several years past, one of the principal owners of two of the largest mills in western Canada, namely, the Red Deer Lumber Company, at Barrows, Saskatchewan, in the spruce district, and of the Elk Lumber Company, at Fernie, British Columbia, in what is known as the mountain district in British Columbia.

Each of these mills has a capacity of about 35,000,000 feet per annum. Each of these mills, with their planing mills, yards, logging equipment, and other necessary improvements, cost us about \$400,000. This is exclusive of the cost of our standing timber.

I have been told by men who own similar mills on this side that their plants and equipment here cost about \$250,000. The difference in cost is accounted for by the tariff charged by the Canadian government on the American machinery with which our mills are equipped.

In other words, Mr. President, those lumbermen in Canada have to come to this country and get our machinery, for they have none of their own, and when they get it there they have to pay a duty of from 20 to 30 per cent, making their plant in the first instance cost them from 25 to 40 per cent more than a plant costs on this side of the line.

Now, here is the testimony of Mr. Lynch in reference to the price of logs:

Our logs at the Red Deer mill, where we are sawing spruce exclusively, cost us at the mill \$7 per thousand. Our stumpage at this mill, together with the royalties paid to the Canadian government, costs us about \$3 per thousand.

I will not take up further time to read it, but will incorporate in my remarks the matter from page 2880 to the foot of page 2883.

The matter referred to is as follows:

At the Elk mill, where we saw cedar, fir, and spruce, our logs cost us \$6 per thousand. Our stumpage at this mill, together with the royalties paid to the government, costs us \$1.50 per thousand. Our cost of manufacturing, including the cost of surfacing, piling, loading, selling, insurance, interest, and taxes at each point is about the same, viz, \$5 per thousand.

We employ no oriental labor in any capacity or place. Most of our employees are Americans. All of our highly skilled employees, including our manager and superintendents, learned their trades or business on this side of the line. They went to Canada for us because we were willing to pay them higher wages than they were receiving here. We were willing to pay these wages because these men were more efficient workmen than we could get on the other side and would do more and better work than the Canadian workmen. They were cheaper for us than Canadian workmen at lower wages, but were no more efficient than the thousands of American workmen employed on this side in American mills, and who, I believe, receive lower wages than we are paying these men.

Mr. LYNCH. I have a statement here showing the average wages paid at the mills of the Elk Lumber Company, at Fernie, British Columbia, and of the Red Deer Lumber Company, at Barrows, Saskatchewan. Perhaps you would not care to have me read this table, and if not, I will pass that and continue my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean wages by the day, hour, or how?

Mr. LYNCH. By the day.

The CHAIRMAN. State the number of hours.

Mr. LYNCH. Based upon ten hours a day.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many days in a week?

Mr. LYNCH. Six days in a week.

The CHAIRMAN. No half holidays?

Mr. LYNCH. No half holidays.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not a statement of the wages paid in the American mills, have you?

Mr. LYNCH. I have not; no, sir. I will file this statement.

Mr. GAINES. How long is the statement?

Mr. LYNCH. It is somewhat less than a page.

The CHAIRMAN. I think perhaps you had better read it.

Mr. LYNCH (reads):

Average wages paid at the mills of the Elk Lumber Company, at Fernie, British Columbia, and of the Red Deer Lumber Company, at Barrows, Saskatchewan, for the years 1903 to 1907, inclusive.

	Per day.
Band sawyers	\$7.50
Gang sawyers	4.50
Tail sawyers	2.50 to 3.00
Edger men	3.00 to 3.75
Trimmer men	3.25
Setters	3.75
Carriage riders	3.00
Helpers on trimmer	3.00
Transfer men and laborers	2.00 to 2.60
Band filer	8.50

	Per day.
Round saw and gang filer	\$7.00
Millwrights	4.00
Engineer	4.00
Fireman	3.00
Blacksmith	3.75
Machinists	3.75
Boom men	3.25
Laborers	2.50
Watchmen	2.50
Grader	2.75
Sorters and transfer men	2.25
Lumber pilers	2.25 to 2.75
Laborers in yard and loading cars	2.25
Oilers in mill and planing mill	2.75
Planing mill:	
Machine feeders	2.50 to 3.50
Helpers	2.25
Teamsters	2.50
Carpenters	4.00
Helpers	2.50
Manager	\$4,000.00
Mill foreman	\$1,500.00
Yard foreman	\$1,500.00
Bookkeeper	\$1,200.00
Timekeepers and clerks	\$60.00 to \$5.00

During the same period the same mills have paid wages to their men in the woods, they doing all of their own work and doing no logging through contractors.

	Per day.
Loaders	\$2.80
Swampers	1.85
Sawyers	2.25
Teamsters	2.35
Railroad men	2.50
Stable boss	2.60
Hook men	2.25
Blacksmith	3.40
Filer	3.00
Camp tender	2.25
Railroad laborers	2.05
Cook	3.40
Cookees	2.25
River men	3.00
Clerks	3.00
Foreman	4.35
Teams without drivers	3.00

The superintendent receives \$1,600 to \$2,000 per annum. All men working in the bush are paid so much per month and their board. The figures given above for their day labor is the amount which they would receive per day, figuring twenty-six working days to the month and adding the cost of their board, averaged in nine different camps, to the daily wage paid to them.

Mr. FORDNEY. How do those wages compare with the wages paid now?

Mr. LYNCH. Those are the same wages that we are paying now. Those are the figures up to July 1, 1908.

I do not think that the wages which we pay are much, if any, higher than those paid by our Canadian competitors. Our scale may be higher in some instances, but it is made up by the increased efficiency of the workmen we employ. I think these wages are higher than those paid by most American plants and are only equalled by a very few of the best inland empire mills.

In the matter of stumpage and its cost on the Canadian side, I would say that it varies greatly, as it does on this side, according to its nearness to market, the facility with which it can be logged, the character of the timber, and the danger of fire. All of the timber in Canada, however, carries a minimum royalty to the government of 50 cents per thousand, board measure (this is equal to about 70 cents per thousand, log scale), and from that up to \$6 per thousand in royalty in some of the eastern provinces. In British Columbia the prevailing royalties are 50 and 60 cents per thousand. To these royalties, to find the cost of stumpage, must be added the bonus which is paid to the Dominion government when the license to cut the timber was issued by the government, and which amounts, according to the competition which prevailed when the timber was sold by the government, to from 15 cents to \$2 per thousand. This bonus is paid to the government in cash when the timber is sold, while the royalty is paid to the government when the timber is sawed. We also pay a royalty to the government on all of our by-products, including laths and shingles.

The item of taxes varies in the different Provinces and on different classes of timber, but runs from \$5 per square mile, which is the lowest annual rental on timber in the prairie Provinces, to \$140 per square mile on the heavy timber in British Columbia, west of the Cascade Mountains. This tax or rental is paid annually and is an addition to the local or business taxes which may be paid. Most of our holdings are east of the Cascades, in British Columbia, in the mountain district, where we pay a tax of \$115 per square mile per annum. On the amount of timber which we hold this tax amounts to about 6 cents per thousand per annum. This is treble the tax paid by us on our holdings on this side of the line. The fee of the land does not go with this. That is always retained by the Crown.

I do not know of any expense item which goes to make up the cost of lumber which is not as heavy or heavier upon the Canadian manufacturer than it is upon the American manufacturer. They are certainly closer to the consumer in the United States than the Canadian mill would be. This would imply lower freight rates and better service for the American mills.

It would appear to me, in view of the foregoing facts, that the American manufacturer will have little fear from the removal of the tariff, unless he raises his prices much above the present level. If his cost of manufacture advances, the cost will also advance to his competitor. If the price of the log on the stump is increased much beyond the present level, the owner of the stumpage will have to compete with the Canadian timber owner, unless he should also advance the price of his stumpage. This, I do not believe he will do. The open competition which would be brought about by the removal of the tariff would not be an evil to the general public.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Lynch gives the figures. I have compared these figures given with the wages on this side of the

• Per year.

• Per month.

line, as given in the House hearings, and I want to say that, taking the labor cost on the whole, with the exception perhaps of the State of Maine, both as regards the white-pine territory and the lumber of the Pacific coast, the wages on the Canadian side are equal to the wages on our side and the cost of production is fully as much.

When you come to the matter of labor in the yellow-pine country we all know, and the House hearings show it, that on an average labor in the Southern States, where the yellow pine is produced, is cheaper than it is in the North and in Canada. They employ a large share of colored labor there, which is very cheap, and a good deal of their white labor, except what you may call the expert labor, is cheaper than with us. So, on the whole, if you rest upon the question of wages, there is no occasion to put on a tariff duty between our country and Canada.

Now there is another matter, Mr. President. The lumbermen claim that they have not been making any money recently. They have not made money perhaps since the panic. There are many industries that have not made any money since then. I have given evidence as to the cost of logging in Washington and British Columbia, and I have equally good evidence as to the question of profits in the lumber business.

Many years ago the great transcontinental lines—the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, and the Union Pacific—fixed a lumber rate for the shipment of lumber from the Pacific coast to the East—Mississippi and Missouri River points. They made a 40-cent rate per hundred to St. Paul, a little more to Chicago and other eastern points.

In the fall or early winter of 1907 the railway companies undertook to raise these rates. They did raise them. A controversy was brought on over it before the Interstate Commerce Commission and there was a hearing before that commission. I have here a copy of the testimony of ex-Governor Clough, formerly of Minnesota, one of the witnesses who appeared before the Interstate Commerce Commission and gave testimony as to the profits in the lumber business. He organized a company called the Clark-Nickerson Lumber Company, composed partly of Michigan men, partly of Minnesota men, to engage in the manufacture and sale of lumber at Everett, in the State of Washington, on Puget Sound. The company began its business there in the fall of 1899, I think, or in 1900, and constructed one of the finest and best lumber mills in that section of the country. There may be larger mills, but I think it is as well equipped as any mill in that section. They started in with a paid-up cash capital of \$100,000, and in the course of their business from 1900 down to 1907 they borrowed \$300,000. By the fall of 1907, after paying their stockholders a yearly dividend of 6 per cent right along, they had earned enough to pay up the interest and the principal of the \$300,000 they had borrowed, and to reimburse the stockholders for all the money they had put into the enterprise. So that their stock at the time practically cost them nothing, and they had a fine mill and a lot of lumber on hand. I may add here that Governor Clough was the general manager of the company during all the time referred to.

Let me read you his testimony. This is his sworn testimony taken before the Interstate Commerce Commission. I have taken only a part of it. The testimony is voluminous. It is not in print, but I had a copy made by a clerk in the office of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Mr. Kerr is the attorney asking questions. He asked Governor Clough:

What have been the prices that you have paid for logs?

I want to say that this Clark-Nickerson Company owned a very little stumpage of their own, but they did not resort to that. All the logs that they manufactured into lumber they bought. They bought the logs; they did not do their own logging. The logs were brought there partly by water. Most of them were towed in, some of them Canadian logs no doubt, for they can come in free if they were not cut on Dominion or provincial land. All the logs sawed they bought, and they manufactured those logs into lumber and sold it.

Page 1250:

Mr. KERR. What have been the prices that you have paid for logs during the operations?

Mr. CLOUGH. Well, different prices; but our average price for five years, commencing January 1, 1902, up to January 1, 1907, averaged \$6.72 per thousand.

"Per thousand" are my words, but that is what it means.

Mr. KERR. What has been the range of the price of logs during that period of time?

Mr. CLOUGH. Oh, when we first went there logs of course were very cheap. The first logs we ever bought in the State of Washington, number twos, we paid \$4; merchantable was \$6, and flooring was \$7.

Mr. KERR. What has been the highest price?

Mr. CLOUGH. In the year 1906 our logs averaged us \$7.78.

This is the year before the collapse. "Our logs averaged us," in the most prosperous year in the lumber trade, "\$7.78."

Mr. KERR. Was that the highest year?
Mr. CLOUGH. That was the highest year.

Page 1254:

Mr. KERR. What has been your cost of producing lumber from the time you commenced operations?

Mr. CLOUGH. About \$3.75 a thousand.

Mr. KERR. Has that price increased or decreased, or is that about the average?

Mr. CLOUGH. Well—

Here is his answer—

we are trying to cheapen the cost a little every year, and we have, a little mite. There has been no material difference in the cost, but we are trying to cheapen it a little every year, regardless of the little increased cost of labor and material.

Mr. KERR. How have you done that, and how are you able to do it?

Mr. CLOUGH. By putting in some new improvements, improving our mill. For instance, this summer we put in \$20,000 in permanent improvements. We took out a single band—

He refers to the saw—

we had and we put in a double-cut band in its place. That increased our cutting capacity about 20,000 a day, with no extra expense—the same number of men.

Mr. KERR. Has the cost or efficiency of labor been affected during these years you have been there?

Mr. CLOUGH. What is that?

Mr. KERR. Has the price of labor changed?

Mr. CLOUGH. It has increased.

Mr. KERR. The price has increased; how about the efficiency?

Mr. CLOUGH. The better the times the poorer the men seem to be. We get less work out of men when times are good than we do when they are bad.

Mr. KERR. How have you been able to offset this increase in the price of labor?

Mr. CLOUGH. As I have told you, by improving our mill in every possible way, increasing the cut of our mill.

Page 1258:

Mr. KERR. Please state to the Commission the amount of your investment and the extent of your operations, generally.

Mr. CLOUGH. Our investment we capitalized for \$100,000. What other money we needed the general manager—and I am the general manager—borrowed, and paid 6 and 7 per cent interest on it; but, thank the Lord, it has all been wiped out, and it has been paid back from our profits. Would you like to know the profits?

Mr. KERR. Yes, the whole situation of the investment and the profits?
Mr. CLOUGH. Our capital stock is \$100,000; that is all we ever had. That has all been paid back to the stockholders. There is no stockholder in our company who has 1 cent of money in the business. They have always received, from first to last, a dividend of from 6 to 7 per cent per annum.

Commissioner COCKRELL—

A member of the Commission—

In addition to the principal?

Mr. CLOUGH. They have always been paid their dividend of 6 per cent per annum every year, and have already been paid back their principal. No stockholder in the Clark-Nickerson Lumber Company has a cent in the business; and we owe no man a cent, except the monthly expenses. We pay off our help and our bills the 10th of every month. On the 10th of every month we pay our labor and our bills for the previous month. When I came down here I had not our profits exactly; I knew about what they were, but I did not have them exactly. I could remember about the report of the different years, but I did not have the figures exact, and so, after listening here for several days, and seeing that you are quite exact in the matter of figures, I thought I would have my figures exactly, and so I wired to our office yesterday, asking them to wire me our profits or losses for each year since we have been in business. I received a reply to my message this noon, and I can read it to you. There is no guesswork about this. We built our mill in 1900—

Mr. ABEL. Are you reading from the wire that you received to-day?

Mr. CLOUGH. No; because I copied it off here so as to have it in handy shape. I will let you see the original message, if you want to [handing witness the original telegram]. You can take that message. I took it off on a piece of paper here, but it is exactly like the original message.

Mr. ABEL. We will check it.

Mr. CLOUGH. You can check everything I have or say. We commenced to build our mill in February—February 26, 1900. We started the mill then and sawed a log September 15 of the same year. We merely started. We did the most of the sawing from that time until December 30 for ourselves, but we did ship a few cars of lumber, and that year—I have not got that off on here. What is that last figure on that telegram? [Addressing Mr. ABEL.]

Mr. ABEL. \$1,634.

Mr. CLOUGH. The first year our profits were \$1,634. We commenced business the best we could. Of course we went there as old lumbermen, but we were new men in the country. We found we had a great deal to learn. We had to establish ourselves in business, and we did so. Our profits were not as large as they are now.

Now, listen to this:

In 1901 our profits were \$29,267, which was 29 per cent and a little over on our investment.

In 1902 our profits were \$96,759, or 96 per cent and a little more on our investment.

In 1903 our profits were \$55,721, or 55 per cent and a little over on our investment.

In 1904 I am ashamed to tell that, as that was a bad year. In that year we made a loss of \$3,358.

In 1905 our profits were \$72,186.

In 1906 our profits were \$193,06.

That is the boom year, before the panic.

In 1906 our profits were \$193,06.

There is evidently a mistake in punctuation; it should read \$193,060.

In 1907 we do not know just exactly what they will be. We have not figured up what they will be; we do not figure up until the 1st of January; but I do know that I have sent this year to our stock-

holders, which I am authorized to do whenever we have any surplus money—to send it to our stockholders pro rata according to our stock—I have this year—

1907—

already distributed among stockholders \$130,000. We certainly have made that \$130,000, or I could not have distributed it among the stockholders. We haven't borrowed any money. We do not owe a cent of money, and the best of it is we put in \$20,000 this year in permanent improvements, and they have been paid for.

Another thing that pleases me is that on January 1, 1907, we had piled in the yard about 6,600,000 feet of lumber. We were closed down for a little repairing about three weeks ago. So we took account of stock, and we had in the yard about 13,600,000 feet—and that after distributing among our stockholders \$130,000.

For 1907. Then he winds up by saying:

That is about all there is to our profits. This telegram is a telegram that anyone can look at, or keep, if anyone wants it.

Mr. KERR. It may be submitted to the opposition.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not know whether the Senator intends to go further upon that line, but I especially want him to call attention to the profits upon the shingle industry in the same period.

Mr. NELSON. I am coming to that.

Mr. SCOTT. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not think the majority of those logs were cut on the Canadian side to make these enormous profits.

Mr. NELSON. No; most of them were cut on our side. They get some logs on the Sound from British Columbia. But you must remember—

Mr. SCOTT. Without paying for them?

Mr. NELSON. Oh, no; you must remember that most of the timber in that country is held under government licenses. I have a copy of them here. Under that system, where they obtain timber in that way, they are required to manufacture it on that side of the line. It is only logs that are cut on private lands, not on the Provincial or Dominion lands, that can be shipped into our country.

Mr. PILES. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. PILES. Did the Senator examine the testimony of any other lumbermen in the State of Washington except that of Governor Clough?

Mr. NELSON. No, I did not.

Mr. PILES. Is not he the only man in the whole State of Washington who testified along the line presented by the Senator?

Mr. NELSON. I do not know; I have not examined the other testimony in the case. I happened to know about his testimony and so took occasion to have a copy of it.

Mr. PILES. If Governor Clough's testimony is correct and that is the general rule throughout the whole lumber district, of course every man in the United States ought to go into the lumber business. But every man in the State of Washington who testified—

Mr. NELSON. The Senator is referring to what has occurred since the panic. I am talking about the time prior to the panic of 1907.

Mr. PILES. That is exactly what I am talking about. I am talking about what occurred prior to the panic. Every lumberman in the State of Washington engaged in it with the exception of Governor Clough, testified before the Interstate Commerce Commission that they could not make a profit on the rate which the railroad companies sought to increase.

Mr. NELSON. And that was only an increase of 10 cents a hundred.

Mr. PILES. Governor Clough has his mill situated on the line of two railroads—the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific—and every—

Mr. NELSON. So has Weyerhaeuser. Weyerhaeuser has his mill right there at Everett.

Mr. PILES. Every other lumberman in the State of Washington testified that he could not make a profit.

Mr. NELSON. I yielded for a question, but I do not yield for a speech. When the Senator comes to discuss the matter he can make his own speech. I say that in the utmost Christian spirit. [Laughter.] Mr. Kerr proceeds:

I understood you to say that you borrowed some \$300,000 in the beginning. Has that been paid back?

Mr. CLOUGH. Yes, sir; every cent of it.

Mr. KERR. Have you ever engaged in the manufacture of shingles, and if so, when?

Mr. CLOUGH. Well, early this year—

That is, 1907—

some of my associates and myself imagined that we wanted to build another sawmill. My associates liked the business, and we talked it over, and I told them I thought we had better build a shingle mill. I wanted to see how much money there was in the shingle business. So we decided to build a shingle mill. Well, they said that they didn't know, they thought perhaps this increased rate was going to be put into effect, which was spoken of then, and "they wanted to know how much money I thought there was in the shingle business, and I told them that I thought we could get 50 per cent on the money we invested, and if the rate was increased it would make a difference of 16 cents a thousand;" there would be that much less in our profits, that is all, and we had better build a shingle mill.

So we went on and built a shingle mill, and that mill had a capacity of 600,000 a day. That is not the Clark-Nickerson Co.; that is the Clough-Hartley Co., located half a mile away from the Clark-Nickerson Co. We built a mill, and we ran it a little over two months, and while we ran it we made a profit of about 100 per cent on our capital; but of course we could not always do that. Shingles were very high this fall, as you all know—very high.

Mr. KERR. What two months were those that the mill was running?

Mr. CLOUGH. On November 1 we closed down, because there wasn't any sale for our shingles.

Mr. KERR. Are you more or less familiar with the price of logs that have been manufactured into shingles in the year past?

Mr. CLOUGH. Well, I don't know about cedar logs as I do fir logs until this fall, while we were in the—

Mr. KERR. What was the price of cedar logs while you were buying them for your shingle mill?

Mr. CLOUGH. Well, we paid all prices. We paid all the way from \$11 to \$18. We bought a few for \$18, and all the way from \$11 up to \$18.

Mr. KERR. Were you at all familiar with the price of cedar logs when you came into the country?

Mr. CLOUGH. No, sir; I was not.

Mr. KERR. What was the cost of manufacturing shingles during these two months when you were operating?

Mr. CLOUGH. It cost Clough-Hartley—that is, including insurance and taxes and everything—about 70 cents a thousand to manufacture shingles, to keep up our mill.

Mr. KERR. That does not include the cost of the timber?

Mr. CLOUGH. No, sir.

Mr. KERR. You have given the price of logs. How many shingles will a thousand feet of cedar logs make?

Mr. CLOUGH. Ten.

In other words, a thousand feet of logs board measure will make 10,000 shingles.

We have in this another piece of evidence, Mr. President, of how prosperous the lumber industry is. I admit it is not prosperous now; partly on account of the panic and partly on account of the excessive price that had been charged for the lumber. But Senators must remember that we have had the same tariff law in 1908 and 1909 that we have had in 1905, 1906, and 1907.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. Does not the Senator think the remarkable man who has been making these statements about the inordinate profits that nobody else has made has been able to make more sums of money during the last year or two than anybody else has?

Mr. NELSON. I think within the last year he has not made any money.

Mr. HALE. Having the power and the ability to make such a remarkable scale of profits, when nobody else in his neighborhood made it, I do not see why he has not been able to continue to make an enormous profit.

Mr. NELSON. The market for lumber has slackened up and become stagnant.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator think that the statement of this remarkable man is a fair statement of the lumbering conditions there?

Mr. NELSON. As it existed out in that country under those conditions and at that time.

Mr. HALE. In the State of Washington?

Mr. NELSON. I want to be fair. I want to say that the mill was operated under more favorable conditions than many other mills for two reasons. I have been at the mill. There are other mills there. On one side of his mill he could load into vessels and on the other side he could load into the cars. I admit that mills in the interior away from such transportation facilities could not make the profit that he did, but it serves to give color to the enormous profits and enormous prices maintained in the lumber business.

Mr. HALE. I think the statement this man has made is the most remarkable I have ever heard in relation to the lumber industry anywhere in the last half dozen years.

Mr. NELSON. Unfortunately—

Mr. HALE. I hope that the representatives of the State of Washington who know about the conditions there and about this industry will give us their light on this subject, and not such remarkable statements as are made in the testimony of this man.

Mr. NELSON. This man has lived out there in that country since 1900.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Is there anything additional in the testimony as to one point made by the witness, that when they double the sawing capacity the adding of saws added nothing to the expense, because they needed to employ no more men? What was the power? Was it steam or water?

Mr. NELSON. Steam.

Mr. WARREN. Would it not cost more to run two saws with steam than one?

Mr. NELSON. Both saws were put up into the same frame. The two were side by side, instead of one, and they could practically run both with the same power.

Mr. WARREN. The power would naturally be for two saws instead of one, and it would practically be twice as much power. So I conclude that the statement that it costs no more would be subject to some qualification at least.

Mr. NELSON. Very little. The Senator knows what fuel they use at the sawmills.

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. NELSON. The fuel practically costs them nothing.

Mr. WARREN. On the other hand—

Mr. NELSON. It is refuse material which they can not dispose of for any other purpose.

Mr. WARREN. It is not sufficient, and they have to buy fuel in addition.

Mr. NELSON. They do not in those great mills.

Mr. WARREN. There is another thing. I notice that in the logs purchased for shingles sometimes they paid \$18 and sometimes \$11. Are there any questions or answers preceding or succeeding the testimony which the Senator has read which may explain that difference?

Mr. NELSON. I suppose there were different varieties of logs and there were different prices. The highest was \$18—the price ran from \$11 to \$18.

Mr. WARREN. Would there be a natural range in the price of cedar shingle logs from \$11 to \$18?

Mr. NELSON. There might be.

Mr. WARREN. Legitimate?

Mr. NELSON. They use a lot of stuff for shingles that they can not use for anything else.

Mr. WARREN. That is true; but the Senator is speaking of the purchase of logs. I want to know if the Senator has pursued that subject so as to be able to give us any explanation. Of course if this statement was in some magazine article or written in a dime novel we would understand that the promoter had put in all the good side and none of the bad.

Mr. NELSON. What does the Senator mean by a magazine article or a promoter?

Mr. WARREN. I mean a written subject.

Mr. NELSON. There is no occasion to be sarcastic. I have stated that this testimony was given under oath before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. WARREN. When a man makes a statement about his business, that in one year when the general business of the country was prosperous he loses \$3,000, and another year makes one hundred and ninety-odd thousand dollars, if sarcasm is not permissible at least a question is, and I am only asking a question. I want to know, if the Senator will be kind enough to inform me, whether there is an explanation in the evidence before us, or, rather, if he can explain why in that one year, when the business of the country was usually prosperous, they lost \$3,000, and the next year made one hundred and ninety-odd thousand dollars? What was there peculiar about the facts to explain the difference in results in those two years?

Mr. NELSON. The sawmill here is on the Sound. It is a steam sawmill. The fuel is the refuse. It is a big, complete mill. I am not prepared to say whether it is the biggest mill on the Sound, but I think in equipment it is as good as any other mill. I understand the Weyerhaeuser Company has a mill right close by; I think in a stone's throw, or perhaps a little farther. I have been in the Clark-Nickerson mill and I have seen it myself. It is a fully equipped mill—mill on the Sound, where vessels can be loaded on one side and cars on the other side. The one year referred to the lumber business was generally dull, the other years referred to good.

Mr. WARREN. We do not doubt that. I submit the Senator has introduced a character of evidence that we ought to observe; we ought to notice and we ought to weigh it.

Mr. President, it is often said that figures will not lie. But liars will figure, it is also said. I do not accuse this man of lying. I could not do that. He is a prosperous and no doubt a truthful and prominent man. But it is in evidence now, and when a man says in his business the first year he made a thousand dollars, that he sawed out lumber for his own work and sawed a few carloads for sale, and the next year—

Mr. NELSON. No; it was that same year he made it. He sawed only a little in the fall of the first year, most of it for his own use in the mill, sold only a few carloads.

Mr. WARREN. I understood that that was in the following year.

Mr. NELSON. Oh, no. It was the first year.

Mr. WARREN. When he says that the next year he made \$29,000, the next year he made \$96,000, the next year he lost \$3,000, the next year he made \$196,000, I agree with the Senator from Maine that it is a most remarkable statement. I should like to know if there is anything to explain it in the testimony which the Senator has before him.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator discredits that testimony—

Mr. WARREN. I do not discredit it. I only wish, if I can get it, some explanation.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator is prepared to discredit it, let him discredit it.

Mr. WARREN. I only discredit it by applying the rules of business that any business man would apply, and the judgment of a business man. I submit to any man in this country who is a business man that that is a remarkable statement. I do not doubt its veracity, but I should like an explanation of it, if there is any to be made.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator doubt the explanation?

Mr. WARREN. I have said I do not doubt it.

Mr. NELSON. I have the testimony here, and if the Senator can make an explanation that will explain it let him do it.

Mr. WARREN. It will need somebody to make an explanation, surely.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator from Minnesota a question?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I should like to ask the Senator a question. The profits were, the Senator stated, \$196,000. I think that the Senator's print is in error. I have \$19,306. The Senator has got the profit too large for that year.

Mr. NELSON. What year does the Senator refer to?

Mr. McCUMBER. If I may just recapitulate it, in 1901 it was \$29,000. I am giving the round numbers. In 1902 it was \$96,000; in 1903, \$55,000; in 1904, a loss of \$3,358; in 1905, a profit of \$72,000; and in 1906, a profit of \$19,306, or 19 per cent.

Mr. NELSON. That is wrong; it is \$193,000 in my copy.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think there is some mistake in the print.

Mr. NELSON. Possibly there may be. This is the copy furnished me by a clerk of the Interstate Commerce Commission. There is probably a mistake in punctuation and that the correct reading is as the Senator from North Dakota suggests—\$19,306.

Mr. HALE. I hope the Senator will not undertake to cut down his remarkable figures in this way. I think he had better take them to their whole extent.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would like to ask the Senator a question. This is the testimony of Governor Clough, as I understand it.

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir; the manager of the Clark-Nickerson Lumber Company.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Clark-Nickerson Lumber Company. Mr. Clark, the president of the company, is from my State. I know him.

Mr. NELSON. I think he is—there are one or two Michigan men in the company.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; but does the Senator know whether Mr. Hovey Clark is a member of that firm?

Mr. NELSON. I can not say. I think he is; but I am not sure.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the Senator know, or has he any data before him, to show whether a profit is derived from exports or from domestic sales?

Mr. NELSON. From both.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think, as a matter of fact, that they are exporting large quantities of heavy timber to the Orient, and that they have had a very continuous demand from that source.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, coming to another question—and I will not dwell on it at great length—all of those mills have had a great export trade. The export trade on the Pacific coast, as appears from the following tables in the House hearings, has been immense, especially since the San Francisco disaster and that at Valparaiso, in South America. They have a big trade by water to various foreign countries, as the tables show.

House hearings, Schedule D, page 3100, Exhibit C.

Shipped from—	Foreign.							
	Australia.	South America.	China and Japan.	Mexico and Central America.	United Kingdom and Europe.	Africa.	Other foreign ports.	Total foreign.
	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.
Washington	28,313,923	21,818,502	4,578,026	6,090,633	6,685,718	5,765,419	3,709,763	76,961,984
British Columbia	6,115,095	12,595,886	2,670,396	2,370,560	8,753,019	1,757,593	34,262,549
Totals, 1894.....	34,429,018	34,414,388	7,248,422	8,461,193	15,438,737	5,765,419	5,467,356	111,224,533
Washington and Oregon.....	43,755,751	32,139,555	12,632,650	6,716,288	5,504,544	28,092,765	2,214,264	131,055,817
British Columbia	5,874,958	6,103,311	4,868,154	5,367,032	5,558,711	9,548,324	3,424,780	40,745,270
Totals, 1895.....	49,630,709	38,242,866	17,500,804	12,083,320	11,063,255	37,641,089	5,639,044	171,801,087
Washington and Oregon.....	44,821,574	34,517,203	22,499,767	13,007,364	9,485,450	11,242,086	9,579,665	145,153,109
British Columbia	17,861,699	11,002,786	15,550,324	1,523,140	9,686,917	3,834,830	3,084,216	62,543,912
Totals, 1896.....	62,683,273	45,519,989	38,050,091	14,530,504	19,172,367	15,076,916	12,663,881	207,697,012
Washington and Oregon.....	46,242,383	25,973,758	35,991,494	9,345,469	16,788,593	8,488,531	10,849,559	153,679,787
British Columbia	22,049,732	6,972,620	12,993,963	3,400,000	8,212,156	8,010,667	649,038	62,288,176
Totals, 1897.....	68,292,115	32,946,378	48,985,457	12,745,469	25,000,749	16,499,198	11,498,597	215,967,963
Washington and Oregon.....	37,147,070	19,215,654	17,940,132	7,864,463	2,265,361	9,142,345	13,318,016	106,893,041
British Columbia	24,993,799	5,928,008	7,755,827	4,890,000	4,408,800	5,886,004	1,272,165	55,134,603
Totals, 1898.....	62,140,869	25,143,662	25,695,959	12,754,463	6,674,161	15,028,349	14,590,181	162,027,644
Washington and Oregon.....	40,877,578	24,969,909	34,658,624	8,201,082	7,409,871	12,041,828	9,070,098	137,228,990
British Columbia	17,990,322	5,399,924	14,901,607	286,136	907,546	6,238,470	3,408,303	49,132,308
Totals, 1899.....	58,867,900	30,369,833	49,560,231	8,487,218	8,317,417	18,280,298	12,478,401	186,361,298
Washington and Oregon.....	56,902,139	34,556,276	33,448,227	9,488,801	8,433,967	12,284,414	4,828,839	159,942,663
British Columbia	31,783,542	8,739,125	4,092,212	105,301	24,676,937	5,117,672	466,724	74,981,513
Totals, 1900.....	88,685,681	43,295,401	37,540,439	9,594,102	33,110,904	17,402,086	5,295,563	234,924,176

House hearings, Schedule D, page 3100, Exhibit C—Continued.

Shipped from—	Foreign.							
	Australia.	South America.	China and Japan.	Mexico and Central America.	United Kingdom and Europe.	Africa.	Other foreign ports.	Total foreign.
Washington and Oregon.....	<i>Feet.</i> 55,428,427	<i>Feet.</i> 39,675,154	<i>Feet.</i> 46,762,371	<i>Feet.</i> 12,898,321	<i>Feet.</i> 7,473,299	<i>Feet.</i> 21,793,210	<i>Feet.</i> 14,370,573	<i>Feet.</i> 198,401,355
British Columbia.....	22,922,452	14,648,804	12,762,692	82,599	10,121,532	8,926,620	3,081,891	67,486,090
Totals, 1901.....	78,350,879	54,323,958	59,465,063	12,980,920	17,594,831	25,719,830	17,451,964	265,887,445
Washington.....	38,578,962	38,159,699	19,658,817	9,701,520	6,277,973	27,145,177	10,563,946	150,085,594
Oregon.....	2,089,411	2,193,265	28,613,841	3,095,625	8,839,737	290,977	40,122,856
British Columbia.....	20,631,920	9,284,552	4,614,192	9,168,616	8,830,463	2,155,265	55,685,008
Totals, 1902.....	61,300,293	49,637,516	52,886,850	12,797,145	15,446,589	40,815,377	13,010,188	245,893,458
Washington.....	72,230,804	53,972,673	34,679,762	8,522,877	14,569,040	37,069,332	2,943,777	223,989,265
Oregon.....	2,346,465	6,063,723	35,708,590	1,792,083	7,828,145	2,083,308	55,822,314
British Columbia.....	5,155,175	10,118,027	6,965,831	275,345	14,653,600	22,104,484	2,966,232	62,238,694
Totals, 1903.....	79,732,444	70,155,423	77,854,183	8,798,222	31,014,723	67,001,961	7,993,817	342,050,273
Washington.....	50,946,307	11,768,443	16,930,822	6,632,564	4,602,020	10,699,800	84,565,039	186,144,995
British Columbia.....	7,699,076	11,373,798	5,705,361	8,076,286	322,728	33,177,244
Oregon.....	4,590,981	22,031,811	2,638,652	2,971,292	29,172,736
Totals, 1904.....	63,176,364	23,142,236	44,667,994	6,632,564	12,678,306	13,338,452	87,859,059	248,494,975
Washington.....	40,622,367	66,797,905	47,489,889	14,830,875	17,181,161	14,108,392	3,216,706	201,030,589
British Columbia.....	13,910,784	11,970,963	4,838,004	14,781,264	4,156,980	153,935	49,811,930
Oregon.....	8,838,578	4,196,477	32,795,225	3,133,832	7,075,976	1,793,102	57,854,190
Totals, 1905.....	63,371,729	82,964,345	85,123,118	14,830,875	35,116,257	25,341,348	5,165,743	308,696,709
Washington.....	63,269,733	87,580,794	31,593,172	17,850,130	10,225,575	7,784,498	3,047,814	221,351,716
British Columbia.....	23,937,218	26,623,607	4,595,753	9,413,870	8,604,204	6,002,210	79,176,862
Oregon.....	23,069,027	5,556,644	69,706,171	201,856	9,533,073	4,460,147	112,526,918
Totals, 1906.....	110,275,978	119,761,045	105,895,096	18,051,986	29,172,518	16,388,702	13,510,171	413,095,496
Washington.....	59,621,663	109,098,714	35,282,855	35,954,438	9,355,806	3,297,710	10,109,350	262,720,586
British Columbia.....	24,336,690	20,687,819	5,617,248	559,022	9,209,422	1,595,075	5,187,932	67,198,208
Oregon.....	31,329,600	7,482,290	56,963,238	2,205,096	2,471,328	100,651,582
Totals, 1907.....	115,487,953	137,268,823	97,863,341	38,718,556	21,036,556	4,892,785	15,297,282	430,565,296
Grand total 14 years' water shipments.....	996,425,205	787,185,853	747,836,548	188,466,537	280,833,370	319,191,810	227,920,753	3,547,711,155

* Panama and New York shipments included.

The idea that the lumbermen of Washington and Oregon can not compete with the lumbermen of British Columbia is extremely ridiculous when you look at these figures, which show that they have practically a monopoly of the export trade from the Pacific coast.

I have the hearings before the committee of the House of Representatives, and I desire to read from page 3100 on the lumber schedule.

Mr. PILES. The Senator from Minnesota began his speech by stating that he did not wish to be interrupted. I do not wish to interrupt him in view of that statement, but, if he desires an interruption, I think I can explain that matter entirely to his satisfaction.

Mr. NELSON. I am willing to answer any question, but if it involves an explanation on the Senator's part—

Mr. PILES. It does.

Mr. NELSON. Then the Senator had better explain it in his own time.

Mr. PILES. Very well.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. NELSON. I will yield for a question.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Do I understand this is the firm of Clark-Nickerson Company?

Mr. NELSON. It is an incorporated firm—the Clark-Nickerson Lumber Company. I do not know the names of all the stockholders.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think Mr. Hovey Clark, of Michigan, is the head of that concern; I feel quite sure about it; and I want to say to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and for the benefit of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], that he is a man of the highest character, that he is not speculative nor a dreamer, and that he is a success from every point of view.

Mr. HALE. Evidently.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And I think it will be generally admitted that that statement is absolutely correct.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the amended statement is certainly a little more practical than the one first made. I should like to ask, if the Senator is willing to answer, and if he has the information—he, I think, remarked that this firm is not making money now—did he mean that it is now making no profit at all?

Mr. NELSON. I do not know what they are making. I understood that there, as in our State, matters have been largely at a standstill in the lumber trade.

Mr. WARREN. For how long?

Mr. NELSON. Stagnation began in the lumber industry, as the Senator would have learned if had listened to me, for I am not here pettifogging—

Mr. WARREN. I understand that.

Mr. NELSON. The stagnation of the lumber industry began in the spring of 1907.

Mr. WARREN. Well.

Mr. NELSON. It began because the prices had got so abnormally high and the prosperity in 1906 had been so great that there was, as it were, an overproduction. Stagnation had set in to a limited extent before the panic in the fall of 1907. When that panic occurred matters were brought to a standstill all over the country, more or less, and especially in such industries as the lumber industry, where they had been inflating prices for a series of years.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that I am not accusing him of pettifogging. I think perhaps I was out of the Chamber when he made the statement about stagnation, and so forth, but I wanted to get, if I could, some information; and the Senator seems abundantly able to give it. As to this dullness, what has been its extent? Has it been that the lumbermen have been losing, or have been at a standstill? The reason why I ask the question is because as to myself and many of those—

Mr. NELSON. Let me ask the Senator—

Mr. WARREN. Let me finish the sentence.

Mr. NELSON. Has the panic affected your industry out in Wyoming?

Mr. WARREN. I was just coming to that, if the Senator had waited. I want to say that as to the price of lumber—and I and those connected with me have been buyers continually—the

prices have not reflected any dullness on the part of the lumber manufacturers of late years. I am asking the question for information, not to detain the Senator, and I want him, if he can, to give some explanation why there should have been such enormous profits made at that time and no profits or perhaps losses are ensuing now, while those of us who are buying lumber seem to be paying as much, or even more for it, now than when these immense profits were being made?

Mr. NELSON. It is difficult to explain to the Senator, because I see he is in an obtuse state of mind this afternoon.

Mr. WARREN. Is the Senator able to explain it to himself? I will ask another question.

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask why the concerns that then made so much, under the same tariff and the same Government and under a state of business that had been fairly profitable, are losing now or making nothing?

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator from Wyoming himself misunderstands the Senator from Minnesota. The Senator from Minnesota does not mean to say that the otherwise universal prosperous condition of business has arrested the triumphal march of this wonderful man, who makes money when nobody else makes it. Has it stopped him from making money during the last two years?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, without intending to be personal, I want to say to the Senator from Maine, in all seriousness, that he is a master of the art of sarcasm.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think I can partially answer the question of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. The Senator indicates that there has been no particular change in the price of lumber in his section of the country during the last year.

I assume the Senator speaks from the standpoint of the retailer, rather than from the standpoint of the wholesaler. If the Senator, however, had looked at the quotations of November, 1907, and then looked at the quotations of January and February, 1908, he would have seen that there was a drop of more than 30 per cent, in many cases up to 50 per cent, in the wholesale price of lumber. The retailers were already stocked up pretty well, and everybody knows that the retailers have combinations of their own. When they were stocked with lumber at a certain price, they intended to continue the sale of that lumber upon the basis of the old price just as long as it was possible, and until they could sell out the lumber that had been purchased at the price of 1907, they would continue the retail prices of 1907, and they have continued them pretty well since that time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am speaking in the time of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and not in my own time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma desire to question the Senator from North Dakota or the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GORE. I desire to question the Senator from North Dakota.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for that purpose?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. I want to ask the Senator from North Dakota if the tariff was as high in January and February, 1908, as it was in November, 1907?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator does not need to ask that question.

Mr. GORE. I hope the Senator will answer it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I do not think the question needs an answer. I think the Senator well knows that there has been no change in the tariff schedules during that time.

Mr. GORE. I desire to ask this further question: If a high tariff is the cause of high wages and high profits, why was not the same high tariff a guaranty of the same high prices in wages and profits in January and February, 1908, as in November, 1907?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has already thoroughly answered that question when he stated that there was an overstocking in the lumber business even prior to the panic of 1907, and that panic, then operating upon the lumber conditions as they were, immediately forced down the price about 30 per cent from the original wholesale

price. I may go further and say that I believe even after they had lowered the price 30 per cent they were still selling at a profit and were not selling at a loss. In other words, I do not believe that during the months of January and February, when the wholesalers had dropped 30 per cent of the original wholesale price, they were doing business just for the pleasure of doing business or for the pleasure of losing money.

Mr. GORE. The point I was getting at was that general business conditions affect wages and profits; that they are not exclusively due to a high or a low tariff, and that under one administration or another prices would fall from 30 to 50 per cent without any reference to a threatened revision of the tariff.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from Minnesota permit me to ask a question of the Senator from North Dakota?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I understood the Senator from North Dakota said that the price of lumber had fallen some 30 per cent as between the manufacturer and the wholesaler and as between the wholesaler and the retailer, but that in some way the retailer charged about the same. Was that correct?

Mr. McCUMBER. No.

Mr. WARREN. He charged about the same prices and retained nearly the same profit?

Mr. McCUMBER. Not as between the wholesaler and the retailer, but as between the retailer and the customer the prices remained about the same.

Mr. WARREN. Business had been dull, and there had not been as much lumber sold. Now, I want to ask the Senator how far that logic goes in our economic structure, that when business is dull and there are small sales the prices are kept up, notwithstanding the cost to the wholesaler and to the retailer is very much less? That the retailer can best keep up his prices in dull times is a new phase of trade with which I never have been acquainted. To say that when business is dull for the retailer and he buys his stock for far less than he does when business is good he continues to retail at the old price is a new proposition to me.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the answer presupposes a stock of goods on hand by the retailer, and that was the condition. There is more or less of a close relation between the wholesaler or the manufacturer and the retailer, and in most instances the manufacturer is himself the wholesaler. There is such a relation as will justify possibly the manufacturer in assisting the retailer in disposing of the stock of goods he has on hand at the old price before he will ask him to take additional amounts at the lower price.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I hardly know where I am, after all this interruption. I am almost in the position that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] described himself to be in this morning. No doubt, by and by, when the other side of this case is presented you will have your attention called to some pictures which have been reproduced in the House hearings, showing Japanese and Chinamen working in the mills in British Columbia. As an offset to these pictures produced in the hearings, I have some pictures here [exhibiting] of Chinamen and Japanese in the mills at Port Blakeley, in the State of Washington; so that you can offset the pictures in one case against those in the other.

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

Mr. NELSON. These were taken on the 20th of March last.

Mr. PILES. I should like to ask the Senator—

Mr. NELSON. And they are fine-looking Japanese and Chinamen, as the Senator from Washington will see if he will come over here and examine them.

Mr. PILES. What mills are they from? I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota that he can find but two mills in the State of Washington that employ oriental labor out of 110,000 white men that are toiling in that industry in that State to-day, and there are 14,000 men working in the shingle industry, who have their protest on file here in the Senate appealing to this body to give them relief against oriental labor, and who say that they are idle from three to six months in a year and can not make a living in the shingle industry.

Mr. NELSON. The figures say that out of 40,000 employed in British Columbia, less than 4,000 belong to the Japanese race.

Mr. PILES. What figures say that?

Mr. NELSON. They are in the hearings. I can not now turn to the exact place.

In British Columbia and in the Province of Ontario most of the timber is cut under licenses from the government. The land is not sold, simply the right to cut timber on what are

known as "crown lands." The government does not sell the land. It sells the timber at public sale. The minimum upset price is 50 to 60 cents a thousand feet. Recollect that the big lumber men on the Pacific coast acquired most of their timber at from 15 to 20 cents a thousand. The Canadian timber is put up at auction, as I have said, at an upset price of 50 cents a thousand feet. The bidders have to pay that in royalty and as much more as the highest bid may be. Whatever the bid is, over and above the royalty, they have to pay in cash immediately, and the royalty of 50 cents a thousand they pay as they cut the logs. I have here the printed form of one of those licenses. There is a time limit fixed, and in all those licenses there is a provision which I will read:

This license is issued and accepted on the understanding that no Chinese or Japanese shall be employed in connection therewith.

So that oriental labor is absolutely cut off from logging. They do employ a few in the State of Washington and a few in British Columbia in the mills, but they employ them in both cases more as a matter of necessity than because they are regarded as cheaper labor. It is true that nominally their wages are a little less; but when you consider their efficiency as laborers, they are as expensive as any set of labor; and Mr. Lamb, of the State of Washington, who is engaged in the logging business, and who came on here and appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means to give his testimony in favor of a reduction of the present tariff, in his testimony which I have quoted, was candid enough to admit that there was practically no difference in the cost of logging on our side of the line and on the British Columbia side.

The truth of the matter is—and that is the most important question involved in this whole case, although the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Wyoming sneered at the figures—that outside of a few railroad men, the wealthy men, the millionaires in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, are the lumbermen. They are the men who have made fortunes. The Senator from Michigan well knows there are lumbermen in that State who are millionaires, and I know the State of Wisconsin has some millionaire lumbermen. You can sneer at this testimony, but it is a remarkable thing that the men who are engaged in the lumber industry in the course of a few years get to be millionaires, while in few other industries are there millionaires unless they have been engaged in stock watering in connection with some corporation. Mr. WARREN has—

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken if he thinks that I am sneering at anything in the subject that he is discussing—

Mr. NELSON. Oh, I meant it in a polite way, not in an offensive way.

Mr. WARREN. Except that I did perhaps discredit to some extent the figures, which the Senator has already withdrawn.

Mr. NELSON. I have not withdrawn them.

Mr. WARREN. There is a difference between \$196,000 profit in a year on a capital of \$100,000 and \$19,000 profit.

Mr. NELSON. I have not withdrawn them.

Mr. WARREN. The statement made by the Senator from North Dakota—

Mr. NELSON. That is his statement; it is not mine.

Mr. WARREN. Are they the figures the Senator wishes to stand?

Mr. NELSON. I have not withdrawn them.

Mr. WARREN. Well, then, the Senator wishes to stick to the figures and approves the statement that the profit was \$196,000?

Mr. NELSON. There is no use in quibbling about this. It is a matter of record in the files of the Interstate Commerce Commission; it is not printed, but it is in typewritten shape. I went down there and read it, and asked them to furnish me a copy. The son of one of the commissioners supplied me with this copy. Whether it is absolutely exact or not I do not know. If the Senator doubts it he can go down and examine the record. It is, in fact, as I quoted it, but I am inclined to think there was a mistake in punctuation in the copy furnished, and that the correct figure is \$193,000. The Senator is evidently hanging a good deal on this probable error in punctuation for want of something more substantial to attack.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to be entirely respectful about this. First, I want to say to the Senator that I represent in part here a State that buys a great deal of lumber, and, so far as I know, sells none outside of its boundary lines. I am in a position to be as easily for free lumber as for protected lumber so far as

the local interests of my State are concerned, and probably I could be for free lumber more easily.

Mr. NELSON. But let me ask a question—

Mr. WARREN. Wait a moment.

Mr. NELSON. Let me ask the Senator, does he not think as to the matter of free lumber that his judgment is warped by hides and by the duty on wool? [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, neither the hide nor the wool of any animal or any man, so far as I know, has ever warped my judgment; but I want to say to the Senator that as a protectionist I am always anxious to be convinced that any commodity which has been under protection should be made free before I vote to make it free, and I have asked of the Senator in good faith the question stated.

Mr. NELSON. I have tried to answer them.

Mr. WARREN. Now, I want to say to the Senator that I do doubt that the concern to which he has referred, or any other concern, under regular business management, made \$196,000 clear profit in one year on \$100,000 capital, when in the year before, under the same conditions throughout the United States, they lost \$3,000. I submit that to the candid judgment of the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. In the first place it was not the year before when the \$3,000 loss occurred. In the next place I can account for the great profit of the years 1906 and 1907, and I will explain it. That year—1906—when they made so much was the year of the San Francisco earthquake followed by the disaster further south at Valparaiso. The result of those disasters was that there was an abnormal demand for lumber in San Francisco and at the other point. Instead of shipping the lumber eastward by rail to the Dakotas, Minnesota, and the Mississippi Valley, they shipped it to San Francisco. They could not supply the demand there fast enough and they got whatever figures they had a mind to ask. Does not the Senator know those facts?

Mr. WARREN. I understand that, but does the Senator propose to predicate his argument for free or reduced lumber tariff rates upon the occurrence of an earthquake that happens, perhaps, once in a lifetime? Does he suggest that the conditions that existed following that earthquake shall guide us in our legislation as to the future, when we do not expect, and pray to God we shall not have, earthquakes every year?

Mr. NELSON. I have never thought that even an earthquake would affect the Senator from Wyoming at all on the tariff. [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. I thank the Senator for his compliment.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator think that in the year he has given for this most remarkable profit, which was paid out to the stockholders of the corporation referred to, the earthquake at San Francisco and the calamity at Valparaiso enabled any other business concerns in the Northwest to make any such inordinate profit as the Senator claims for this particular concern? Does the Senator wonder that the statement is so remarkable, as brought out by the criticism of the Senator from Wyoming, that other Senators doubt—not the sincerity of the Senator from Minnesota, because we have summered and wintered with him and know that he is always sincere—but he is under a wrong impression and he has been deluded.

Mr. NELSON. That is the way I feel about the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Wyoming. [Laughter.]

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly the Senator feels that way.

Mr. NELSON. Yes; both of you seem so utterly deluded that you refuse to see the truth when it is presented to you.

Mr. HALE. I am not alone in this matter. The statement of the Senator from Minnesota was so remarkable, was so opposed to the experience and observation of everybody connected with this business, and disclosed what was such an apparent extravagant profit, that it discredited the entire statement. I am wrong entirely if I am not justified in saying that the impression conveyed to other Senators was that the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota could not be depended upon—not his sincerity—but he has either gotten the figures all wrong, as the Senator from North Dakota indicates, or he has been misinformed.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I did not rise to contradict either the opinions of the Senator or his sincerity of statement. I did doubt, and I still doubt, whether the statement can be maintained that a business conducted, as I suppose that was, in a legitimate way, could vary from \$3,000 below par to \$196,000 above par in net yearly profits on a capital of \$100,000.

Mr. NELSON. And \$300,000 of borrowed money.

Mr. WARREN. It might vary in a number of years, but hardly to the extent the Senator suggests. I want to ask, When was the earthquake in San Francisco? When were the largest profits of that concern realized, and does the Senator connect them? If so, I wish he would tell me. I am asking in good faith, because, as I say, I have made no declaration as to how I am going to vote upon this schedule, but to a business man who has done business in dollars and cents all his life the statements of the Senator's witness seem so remarkable that I think I ought to be excused for seeking further light and asking the Senator in good faith whether he had noticed what preceded or followed in the testimony of the witness from whom he quoted, or whether the Commission put the questions which would have occurred to me, and I assume occurred to them, to ascertain the reasons for that abnormal condition which, with small capital, should enable a business concern to make that enormous profit in one year, and bring about a net loss in one year right in between two profitable years. I am asking these questions in good faith.

Mr. NELSON. I am sorry for the Senator. I want to say, in the first place, that I regard it as utterly hopeless to attempt to convert the Senator from Wyoming or the Senator from Maine. That is not the purpose of my remarks. I regard those Senators as utterly incorrigible, and I shall feel complimented if they continue to doubt. I expect nothing else.

Mr. WARREN. Is the Senator willing to put himself on record as saying that that statement is correct?

Mr. NELSON. I am ready to put myself on record that it is a copy of the testimony furnished me from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. WARREN. That is another thing.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator can go down and examine the files, and if he can find a mistake he can make the most of it.

Mr. WARREN. I thought perhaps the Senator himself might discover it.

Mr. NELSON. How do you know it is a mistake? You are assuming that.

Mr. WARREN. I do assume it, and I wish to be recorded in that way.

Mr. NELSON. All right. I can not help in what violent presumptions the Senator indulges.

Mr. WARREN. If it is a violent presumption, I am willing to submit to the judgment of the Senate and the country, which has the more abnormal judgment—the man who swallows wholly a proposition from a business concern, so abnormal and so unreal as that indicated by the figures the Senator has quoted, or the man who believes that there has been some mistake in copying, and that the Senator himself, when he reviews the case, will desire to correct himself as to those figures.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. Either I misunderstood the Senator from Minnesota, or else the Senator from Wyoming misunderstood him. The Senator from Wyoming represents that he said there was a loss of \$3,000,000 one year and the next year a profit of \$193,000,000—

Mr. NELSON and others. Oh, no.

Mr. GORE. Thousands. A profit of \$193,000 the next year. That is as I remembered the statement of the Senator from Minnesota. I merely wanted to be correct. I was in error.

Mr. DICK. Will not the Senator print, in his remarks, the form of contract?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota to restate the results for the three years, including the loss of \$3,000 and the two succeeding years. I think the Senator from Wyoming misunderstood him, or else I have misunderstood him. I wish the record to be correct on the proposition.

Mr. NELSON. I will read the figures again, Mr. President. It began in the fall of 1900, and most of the sawing was done for themselves.

Mr. GORE. 1904, 1905, 1906.

Mr. NELSON. I will read it:

The first year of our profits were \$1,634.

In 1901 our profits were \$29,267, which was 29 per cent and a little over on our investment.

In 1902 our profits were \$96,759, or 96 per cent and a little more on our investment.

In 1903 our profits were \$55,721, or 55 per cent and a little over on our investment.

In 1904 I am ashamed to tell that, as that was a bad year. In that year we made a loss of \$3,358.

In 1905 our profits were \$72,186.

In 1906 our profits were \$193,060.

It should be and was meant for \$193,060.

He states further that he did not know exactly what the profits were for 1907, but that he had already distributed among the stockholders \$130,000.

Mr. KEAN. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment? I think if the Senator from Minnesota will look at that statement, the last one, of \$193,060, he will find it is the only one that is given in cents, and I think he will find that the punctuation is wrong, and that it is nineteen thousand and odd dollars.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator will find there should be six figures, numerals and ciphers. However, the Senator from Minnesota is sure he is right.

Mr. NELSON. It is possible there may be a mistake as to this one year. I will show the Senator from Wyoming the original figures, as I have them here. But whether there is a mistake as to this one year or not, one fact stands out clear; the company started with a cash capital of \$100,000. It borrowed \$300,000, and in the course of seven years it has paid a yearly dividend of 6 per cent to the stockholders, paid up all borrowed money with interest, and repaid to the stockholders all the capital they originally invested, and after all this is left with a fine sawmill and several million feet of lumber. The quibbling over one year's profit does not destroy these hard facts or the aggregate result.

Mr. PILES. I think the Senator from Minnesota is right. I know great comment was made all over the Pacific coast at the time this matter came up. The testimony is that in 1905 they made a profit of seventy odd thousand dollars, according to his statement. In 1906, the banner year, of course they must have made more than \$72,000, according to his statement. Everybody in that whole country was very much astonished when the statement came out that this one mill, the only mill upon the Pacific coast, had been able to make anything like this sort of profit. I do not think the Senator is mistaken in his figures. I think that is exactly as he will find them.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think there is no question about any of the figures, except the very last item. There is evidently an error in the punctuation mark there.

Mr. HALE. A small error!

Mr. McCUMBER. It is an error.

Mr. HALE. Of how much?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is an error; that is sufficient; and of course the difference would be between thousands and hundreds of thousands.

Mr. HALE. Between nineteen thousand and a hundred and ninety thousand.

Mr. McCUMBER. That would be my conclusion, undoubtedly. Otherwise it would be \$193.06, which of course was not intended.

Mr. HALE. It reduces the absurdity of the statement so much.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator found it equally absurd in all the prior figures of \$96,000 and of seventy odd thousand for others years; and there is no mistake about that.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. FLINT. I think there can be no question that on the Pacific coast during the year 1906 very large profits were made by those engaged in the lumber industry. As a matter of fact, after the earthquake in San Francisco, which took place in April, 1906, the conditions were such that they could not find enough lumber schooners or vessels to carry the lumber. Extravagant prices were charged in San Francisco and along the entire coast, and during that year the lumber men were charged with having a combination and with having charged excessive prices; and there can be no question that they did make very large profits during that year.

Mr. NELSON. That vindicates what I said a moment ago. It verifies it. That is precisely the case. Those mills on the coast took advantage of the conditions prevailing in San Francisco, when the whole city was in ruins and the people were anxious to rebuild as fast as possible, and the mills could scarcely meet the demand fast enough.

Mr. PILES. I wish to refute that statement in behalf of the mill men of the State of Washington. Taking the figures the Senator himself quoted that the price of lumber at the mills

in the State of Washington was \$14.02 a thousand, how can it be said that those mill men, who sold their lumber to the intermediate men on Puget Sound, were holding up the people of San Francisco or at any other point?

Mr. NELSON. They shipped their products, and the Senator from California knows the price which was there paid. The average figures I gave from the government report was the average price for the entire country.

Mr. FLINT. I want to correct that statement, if I gave the impression that it was because of a combination of the lumber men. The Senator from Washington [Mr. PYLES] has called my attention to the fact. I wish to correct it. In my opinion it was not a combination of the lumber men in the Northwest, but a combination of those engaged in the business in San Francisco, and they not only charged extravagant prices for lumber, but for all other kinds of material, so that the people were aroused there and stopped building in order to meet that condition. I am convinced that the lumber men in the Northwest did not receive those high prices. The labor situation, as is suggested to me, was just as bad as the material situation.

Mr. NELSON. At the request of the Senator from Ohio, I will ask to have the form of Canadian timber license incorporated in my remarks.

The matter referred to is as follows:

BRITISH COLUMBIA—LAND ACT AND AMENDMENTS—TIMBER LICENSE.

In consideration of ——— dollars now paid, and of other moneys to be paid under the said acts, and subject to the provisions thereof, I, W. S. Gore, deputy commissioner of lands and works, license ——— to cut, fell, and carry away timber upon all that particular tract of land described as follows:

The duration of this license is for ——— year from the ———, 190 .
The license does not authorize the entry upon an Indian reserve or settlement, and is issued and accepted subject to such prior rights of other persons as may exist by law, and on the undertaking that the government shall not be held responsible for, or in connection with, any conflict which may arise with other claimants of the same ground, and that under no circumstances will license fees be refunded.

N.B.—This license is issued and accepted on the understanding that no Chinese or Japanese shall be employed in connection therewith.

Deputy Commissioner of Lands and Works.

LAND AND WORKS DEPARTMENT,
Victoria, B. C., ———, 190 .

Mr. NELSON. As bearing on the question of prices and on the question of wages, I ask to have the Secretary read the letter which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

HON. KNUTE NELSON,
SAUK RAPIDS, MINN., April 19, 1909.
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Inclosed I am sending you a clipping from the Pioneer Press of the 18th Inst., which states your position on the tariff on lumber. I am sure you are right on this proposition.

I am sure that every farmer and laborer of your home State thinks you are right and will back you to the finish; though the rest of your colleagues may call you an insurgent your home people will be with you. I am glad that Senator McCUMBER is with you. Senator CLAPP ought to fall in line.

Perhaps I do not know very much about the lumber business, but I spent about fifteen years of my life driving on the river and working in the sawmills, so I have had some experience as a workman.

I have stood at my machine year after year and saw lumber advance dollar after dollar per thousand, and have never yet seen the boss come in and say, "Boys, lumber has gone up; we are going to raise your pay."

I know that our little mill here, which saws about 50,000 feet per day, is only a drop in the bucket as compared with the great lumber industry of the United States, but I do know that it is a straw that shows which way the wind blows.

I do know that Thos. Shevlin and his Co. is the owner of this mill, and that his company is one of the big companies operating in this State; and what his big mills are doing elsewhere our little mill here is following suit. I know that common laborers in 1906 here received \$2 per day, and this year they are only receiving \$1.65. I know that No. 1 flooring in 1903 was worth \$28 per M. and to-day it is held at \$36 per M.

I know the lumberman's argument, that pine stumpage is worth more to-day than it was six or eight years ago. I think they are right in this contention. The law of supply and demand must prevail, but they ought to understand this law thoroughly.

The men who make it possible for them to manufacture their raw material into a marketable product are also subject to the law of supply and demand; their families need just as much to-day and more than they did years ago, because has not our late President, Mr. Roosevelt, promulgated the fact that we must look out for race suicide. Our families are larger, our living expenses are greater, and our wants are as many.

We are looking to you to make the burden lighter. We do not wish to make your burden harder. We only know that we have a Senator that we all can love and obey.

Very friendly yours,

CHESTER A. COBORN.
Per C. G.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield to his colleague?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. I expect before this discussion ends to take part in it and to advocate the reduction, if not the abolition, of the duty on lumber. In view of the reference in this letter, I would not want it at that time to seem that there had been any following in this matter. There are Senators on this floor who will recall that, almost two years ago, I urged upon them the importance of taking the duty off of lumber. I have not believed for five years that the duty on lumber bore any earthly relation to the price or production, and when I come to discuss the question I will take the position and urge it, that if Congress had done this two years ago, upon its own motion, we would not to-day be in the frenzy and hysteria of tariff revision.

Mr. NELSON. I believe in always being candid with Senators. I think the big owners of pine stumpage who have succeeded in capturing nearly all of the timber of this country, with the exception of little odd fragments here and there, are at the bottom of this whole difficulty. I know that in the State of Minnesota—and we are still the main white-pine lumber State—the only lumbermen who are insisting upon a high tariff, and the only men who have urged me to vote for it, are the men who bought these millions of acres of stumpage on the Pacific coast. A representative of the Weyerhaeuser Company called on me and wanted to spend an hour with me to discuss this question. I told him it was a useless task; that there was no use wasting any of his precious time on me. I have had letters from other gentlemen, but the only lumbermen in Minnesota who have asked me to stand by the high tariff of the Dingley Act are the men who have bought all this immense amount of pine stumpage on the Pacific coast—in Oregon, in California, and in Washington—and the yellow pine of the South. They have a monopoly of it just as the steel trust has of the iron ore of this country; and what are they after? They are marking up their stumpage, and what they want us to do—and they are here through their representatives—is to keep up a stiff tariff in order that they can hold up the stumpage prices. Are we to use the legislative power of this country to enable men to speculate in stumpage? That is the question at the root of this matter. Are you going to arm them and equip these great men, who practically monopolize the lumber supply of this country, with the power of levying tribute on the American people and with the power of making any price they see fit?

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

Mr. NELSON. Wait until I get through. You will have time. If you examine the figures you will find—and I want to treat the mill men fairly—that the greatest increase has not come from labor or from the expenses of the mill men or their profits. The greatest increase has been brought about by the men who own the stumpage. They have been marking it up from year to year, from month to month. They have marked it up from 15 and 20 cents a thousand to a dollar, two dollars, and three dollars a thousand, and in some cases, eight and nine dollars.

These gentlemen have control of, practically, the timber supply of the country, outside of what is in Government reservations; and it is a remarkable thing that the timber men, these big men, have patted Mr. Pinchot on the back. They have been so glad that he has taken so much land into forest reserves. The more he took, the closer the corporation and the bigger the monopoly for them. Now, are we going to make ourselves the servants and creatures of such a great monopoly? Unfortunately we can not do what our Canadian friends on the North have done. I read from their tariff law. Unfortunately we can not legislate in this way, under our constitutional limitations. I read from their customs tariff act of 1897:

Whenever the governor in council deems it to be in the public interest—

The governor in council, I may say, is the governor with his cabinet. It is practically the cabinet; the ministers of that country—

Whenever the governor in council deems it to be in the public interest to inquire into any conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement alleged to exist among manufacturers or dealers in any article of commerce to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers in such article, at the expense of the consumers, the governor in council may commission or empower any judge of the supreme court, or of the exchequer court of Canada, or of any superior court or county court in Canada, to hold an inquiry in a summary way and report to the governor in council whether such conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement exists.

The judge may compel the attendance of witnesses and examine them under oath and require the production of books and papers, and shall have such other necessary powers as are conferred upon him by the governor in council for the purpose of such inquiry.

Now, mark you! If the judge reports that such conspiracy, combination, agreement, or arrangement exists in respect of

such articles, the governor in council may admit the article free of duty, or so reduce the duty thereon as to give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in the article if it appears to the governor in council that such disadvantage to the consumer is facilitated by the duties of customs imposed on a like article.

Unfortunately we can not engraft such a provision on our tariff law under our constitutional limitations, but we can do this: We can by our tariff legislation cease to arm and equip these men with the power to levy tribute on the American people. Think of the rise of more than a hundred per cent in the price of lumber from 1898 to 1907—a hundred to a hundred and fifty per cent! Think of the prices and then look! I have not the time and will not take the time of the Senate to read from the hearings in the House, but I ask gentlemen to look at the figures there and see how these gentlemen have been marking up their pine stumpage all over the country. Are we to make ourselves the creatures of these speculators and aid them to levy tribute upon the American people?

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to another feature of this bill—the duty on planed and grooved boards and lumber. While the bill reduces the duty on unplanned boards and lumber 50 per cent, the differential or cumulative duty on planed and grooved lumber of the Dingley law is retained. Although I am in favor of free lumber, yet by way of compromise I might bring myself to agree to a flat rate of \$1 per thousand on all classes of lumber, whether planed or unplanned. There is no good reason for the high duty on planed and grooved lumber, as I shall show you beyond any doubt or peradventure. This bill provides that in addition to the \$1 per thousand on unplanned lumber, where it is planed on one side it shall pay in addition 50 cents, planed on two sides an extra dollar, planed on three sides a dollar and a half extra, planed on four sides two dollars extra, and planed on one side and matched, as we call it, or grooved one dollar and a half, planed on two sides two dollars and a half.

Now, what are the facts? I desire to call your attention to them. First of all I want to show you what the cost of planing and grooving is. The old style of planing in the old obsolete mill was to put a piece of lumber through once for every side you planed. You put it through once to plane it on one side, then put it through again to be planed on the other side, and then put it through to be matched, or grooved, as it is called in the bill. I read from a letter of the Brooks-Scanlon Company, of Minneapolis, Minn., one of our large lumber concerns:

We understand the lumber schedule will be considered in the near future by the Senate and that the Payne measure provides for a very heavy duty on finished lumber coming into this country on the presumption that it is a protection to the American laborer. This is a very erroneous idea. We are operating one large sawmill in this State that has been cutting 100,000,000 feet, and two sawmills in the State of Louisiana that have been cutting 100,000,000 feet annually. The cost of finishing lumber at the planing mill at Scanlon, Minn., for 1908 was \$0.487 per thousand feet and \$0.458 per thousand feet at the Kentwood, La., plants. This cost includes repairs and supplies and covers all lumber sent through the planing mill, but does not include lumber shipped in the rough. The cost at our Scanlon plant is high, as practically all of the low grades are shipped to the cargo trade via the Great Lakes in the rough. This leaves the high-grade stock to be finished at the planing mill, and the average cost per thousand feet would be very much less if we were to sell our product to the retail dealers the same as the average lumberman does. Our cost in Louisiana is very much higher than it would be in Minnesota, due to the fact that 45 per cent of the yellow pine lumber is cut up into 4-inch strips, while lumbermen in the Northern States make it a practice to saw their lumber as wide as possible because wider widths command higher prices, while the reverse is true in the South. The cost of planing narrow lumber is very much greater than it would be for wide widths, as usually only one piece is put through the machine at a time. Why the duty should be higher on lumber whether surfaced one, two, three, or four sides is a mystery to us, as it is not necessary to put a piece of lumber through a machine more than once to dress it on all four sides, and it seems ridiculous to increase the duty on that account. Many years ago, with the old style planing-mill machinery, it was necessary to put a piece of lumber through the machine as many times as you had sides to dress, but that type of machine is obsolete, and we do not think there are any in use at any of the mills in this country now.

* * * * *

BROOKS-SCANLON LUMBER CO.

Thus it appears that you can run a board through the planing mill, have it planed on both sides, and grooved or matched all in one operation at a cost not exceeding 50 cents per thousand feet. There is another saving, too, in the matter of dressed lumber, and that is in the matter of transportation—the freight. Lumber is shipped by weight, at so much per hundred pounds. There is a great difference in the weight of a thousand feet of unfinished lumber and of dressed lumber. The following statement, compiled from the House hearings, illustrates the difference:

TRANSPORTATION CHARGES, ROUGH AND FINISHED LUMBER, PER THOUSAND FEET.

According to statement in brief of W. S. Dwinell, pages 3074-3075: Rough yellow pine weighs 2,700 pounds per thousand feet. Finished yellow pine weighs 2,200 pounds per thousand feet.

According to brief of National Lumber Association, page 8071: Rough lumber weighs 2,500 to 3,000 (average 2,750) pounds per thousand. Finished lumber weighs 400 pounds per thousand less.

Accepting Mr. Dwinell's statement and assuming a freight rate of 50 cents per hundred pounds freight rate, transportation on rough lumber costs \$13.50 per thousand feet. Transportation on finished lumber costs \$11 per thousand feet.

Accepting National Lumber Association figures and same rate, transportation of rough lumber costs \$13.75 per thousand feet, and transportation of finished lumber costs \$11.75 per thousand feet.

In consequence of the differences very little rough lumber is shipped by rail. Hence free rough lumber by itself will not help interior points much. They need free or reduced tariffs on finished lumber.

The foregoing statement shows that it costs 15 per cent less to ship 1,000 feet of dressed than undressed lumber, and hence that is the lumber that is sold and shipped, as I have already pointed out. Over 90 per cent of the lumber sold and used is dressed lumber, and undressed lumber is sold at a higher rate than dressed lumber on account of the higher cost of transportation.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. Is it not a fact that lumber is not shipped by actual weight, but by estimated weight, and that the basis upon which finished lumber is shipped is entirely different from that upon which rough lumber is shipped?

Mr. NELSON. No; that is not always true. The railways may not weigh every car, but they get at an average by sample weighings. By weighing, a rule as to weight of rough and finished lumber is established at so much per thousand. To verify the statements I have made I ask the attention of Senators to page 24 of this statistical document laid on our desks. Turn to paragraph 197. You will notice that undressed lumber is \$17.02. You see the figures. Seventeen dollars and two cents a thousand is the average price of undressed lumber. Planed or finished on one side the average price is \$12.50 a thousand, as the figures show. Planed or finished on two sides the average price is \$17.40 a thousand, a difference of only 38 cents. Planed or finished on four sides, \$18.93. Planed on one side and tongued and grooved, which is flooring, \$15.71, over a dollar a thousand cheaper than the undressed lumber. Planed on two sides and tongued and grooved, \$17.26 a thousand. These figures, compiled by experts, verify what I have pointed out, and show there is no ground for a higher rate of duty on the dressed than the undressed lumber.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to call the Senator's attention to something that will corroborate his statement. In the schedules of the prices of two lumber companies—

Mr. NELSON. I have the same, and I was about to quote them.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator can quote them.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will allow me, the statement of the paragraph he read is interesting, but I did not catch it clearly. Will he tell me the number of the paragraph from which he has been reading?

Mr. NELSON. It is paragraph 197, page 24. You will find the total amount of imports; you will find the quantity, the thousand feet; you will find the price; and you will find the average value.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to ask the Senator if he has looked up the market price, so as to reach an average of the market price at different points or at some one point.

Mr. NELSON. That is furnished by the statistics.

Mr. WARREN. I agree with the Senator that dressed lumber in some markets is lower than the same lumber in the rough. I agree with him in that statement. It is owing, I suppose, to transportation.

Mr. NELSON. To transportation. Wherever the lumber has to be transported any distance, either by rail or water, that is true. Look at the figures.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator, in quoting, did not quote lumber from the Philippines.

Mr. NELSON. No; that has no relevancy, as the Senator can see; but the Senator can see the figures there and the average price, which is verified to a very large extent. I have two business circulars here which verify it further. Those who say there is no lumber trust ought to look at these to see how alike they are. One is the price list of William Buchanan, manufacturer of band and gang sawed yellow-pine lumber, Texarkana, Ark.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. NELSON. I ask the Senator to wait a moment. The other is the price list on yellow pine of the W. F. Ferguson Lumber Company, of St. Louis. They are just alike in form, print, ink, and rates. The points, Texarkana and St. Louis, are over 400 miles apart. It shows how they work in harmony. Now I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I wish to ask about the figures which the Senator quoted from the record, rough lumber seventeen dollars and something a thousand, and lumber planed on one side twelve dollars and something a thousand. That is a remarkable statement, and I myself do not know about it. I should like to have the Senator, or some member of the Finance Committee, give an explanation of it. It seems inconceivable that lumber on which so much work has been done, planed on one side, should be \$5 cheaper than the other. I do not know what the explanation is, and I should like to hear it.

Mr. NELSON. The explanation I have already given, in my blunt way. I showed, in the first place, that it costs less than 50 cents a thousand to plane and groove lumber. I have shown that there is a difference of at least \$2, if not more, a thousand, in favor of finished lumber in the matter of freight. It costs \$2 a thousand less to ship a thousand feet of dressed and planed lumber than it does a thousand feet of undressed lumber, any considerable distance.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will pardon one other question; in reading paragraph 197, I see "sycamore and basswood." I have not looked through, but I will ask the Senator if pine is given there anywhere.

Mr. NELSON. I have just taken those figures that the Committee on Finance has given us.

Mr. WARREN. Possibly I may ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance whether pine lumber is given.

Mr. NELSON. To ease the Senator's conscience, and still further to verify it, as he seems to be in a doubting mood to-day about everything I have said—

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator is rather more sensitive than usual.

Mr. NELSON. Oh, no.

Mr. WARREN. I am in entire harmony with his statement that oftentimes dressed lumber is cheaper than rough lumber. I want to get closer. I want to agree further with the Senator if I can.

Mr. NELSON. I fear the Senator will have hard work to agree with me.

Mr. WARREN. I agree with the Senator on that point.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. WARREN. I should like to know—

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator from West Virginia will yield to me a moment I will then yield to him. I want to make it easy for a "doubting Thomas" now. [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow me right there?

Mr. NELSON. I ask the Senator to come here and look at these price lists in my hand, and to which I have already referred. These price lists both quote in red ink rough lumber at from \$1.75 to \$2.25 per thousand higher than dressed lumber. Come and examine these figures. You can see from an inspection of those two circulars sent out to the trade that they ask from \$1.75 to \$2.25 per thousand more for the rough and undressed lumber than they do for the dressed. Why should they not do it?

Mr. WARREN. I have admitted that.

Mr. NELSON. Why should they not do it, because they are even then ahead in the cost of transportation?

Mr. WARREN. I have admitted that, Mr. President, but I want to call the Senator's attention to this: He was good enough to invite me over a few moments ago to verify a statement that a concern had made one hundred and ninety-six thousand and some dollars in a year, and upon the statement he showed me, and I challenge him to contradict it, the typewritten figures showed \$196.06.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am surprised to see the Senator still quibbling about that. Those figures put him into a state of nightmare, and he has not gotten over it yet.

Mr. WARREN. I fear along the line of the statement the Senator is making, or rather is avoiding, I may not get over it. I asked him whether that was the rate on pine and common lumber. The Senator has not answered me.

Mr. NELSON. I have the figures just as the Senator has before him. I took those figures just as they were. The Senator has the same information that I have in the statistical book before him, compiled by experts under the direction of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. NELSON. I owe an apology to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I owe an apology to the Senator from Minnesota for interrupting him. I want to ask the Senator whether a few years ago Minnesota did not have a great deal of lumber, and if the Senator did not in 1897 vote for a duty on lumber?

Mr. NELSON. I voted for the bill, but everybody who knows me in Minnesota and everybody here knows that I was against

the duty on lumber. I believed then, as I do now, that the lumbermen were in such a dominating position and had acquired stumpage at such cheap rates, and that they had complete control of the home market, and that as against Canada the control of the foreign market too; in short, that they had such complete control of the situation that they had no need of protection. An industry that has practically become and shown itself to be a most exacting monopoly should have no tariff protection.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether he thinks protective duties on lumber are equally protective of American forests, and if, on the contrary, high duties on lumber do not lead to an undue devastation of our forests?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly. The Senator is right, and I am much obliged to him for calling my attention to that feature of the case.

Looking not from the standpoint of the stumpage owner and the lumber manufacturer as these selfish lumbermen do, but looking to the future welfare of our country, as a man who is interested in its future development and prosperity, I emphatically say, preserve our own forests as long as possible. We should preserve and save our timber supply as long as possible, for at the rate we are going the evil day will come before many years when the supply of timber in this country will be scarce and much less plentiful than it is to-day.

I know we are all creatures of our environment. I have lived in Minnesota among our lumbermen since 1871. I have never owned a pine tree or an acre of pine land. So far as lumber is concerned, I have been merely a lumber consumer. But I have lived in the midst of those lumbermen. Most of them got that valuable white-pine timber in Minnesota for a mere nominal price. They got for a dollar and a quarter an acre the most valuable pine stumpage in the country. A part of it was taken with agricultural college scrip that cost them less than a dollar an acre. Part of it was taken with other scrip at a very low figure. It did not average them 10 cents per thousand. But that is not the worst of it. The most lamentable part of it was the manner in which they carried on their logging operations. They were not content with proceeding in a rational way and cutting only the mature timber as they ought to have done, but they slashed and cut every tree, big and small, and left the debris scattered about, a nursery for forest fires. Had they spared the young trees these would have grown and furnished the seed for more trees. As it was, and has been, they left a barren waste in the wake of their logging operations. In short, they ruthlessly destroyed every tree within reach, and left the refuse and rubbish undisposed of, so that when fires came into the country it resulted in great destruction of property and in preventing the reforestation of the pine. The great fire that we had up in the iron range country last fall was aggravated in its dire results by the fact that the lumbermen had stripped and denuded the land and left the debris, refuse, and rubbish undisposed of and uncared for.

And what are they still doing? They still cut every tree, big or small, in reach, even trees that will make nothing but lath and pickets, and even tamarack poles and jack pine. Where logging has been carried on it is as though a tornado had passed over the ground.

But those gentlemen ought to be protected—protected by a good round duty, they say. Fellow Senators, our hearts ought to go out to those poor lumbermen who have made their millions and who have ruthlessly stripped our lands of the timber and reduced us to the conditions I have described. But, seriously, ought we not to take a broader and more patriotic view of the case and have an eye to the future welfare of our country, and not make ourselves the mere instruments of the god of Mammon of the lumbermen and the stumpage exploiters, who want our help to still further enhance and inflate the value of their holdings? It is a matter of pure speculation with them. They push a few of the mill men forward as skirmishers and wage their crusade behind this cover, with a cry about American labor. What do these big stumpage holders care for the laboring man? They care as little for him as for the American consumer. In Minnesota the men that are so insistent upon tariff protection are the men who have secured so much stumpage in the South and on the Pacific coast—the Weyerhaeusers and their affiliated companies—Walker, who has got most of the California pine, C. A. Smith & Co., and a few others. These are the men who are so clamorous for tariff protection, and who claim to be suffering for the want of a protective duty.

Why, you will send these unfortunate men to the poorhouse unless you continue the tariff on lumber.

As I said some time ago, all legislation is to some extent a compromise. If the bad amendment in paragraph 196—the words “other than sawed”—that joker, as I call it, is eliminated, and the cumulative duty is taken out of paragraph 212, I should be disposed to consent to a flat rate of \$1 per thousand for finished and unfinished lumber alike.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Minnesota permit me? Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. As far as paragraph 196 is concerned, that paragraph, as I understand it, applies only to timber used for spars or in building wharves. It was only intended to apply to timber of that kind. The law prior to 1897 provided for sawed timber separately and for spar wood separately.

The Senate committee have under consideration an amendment to paragraph 196 to make the meaning absolutely plain. I had not expected that this schedule would come up for discussion to-day. The committee had intended, when the paragraph was reached, to suggest an amendment. I think the Senator from Minnesota is right, that it is susceptible of a double meaning, and it is the intention of the committee to suggest an amendment that will make the meaning clear.

Mr. NELSON. You mean paragraph 212?

Mr. ALDRICH. No, 196. As to paragraph 212, I think the Senator is mistaken as to the meaning of that paragraph. It only means that woods, such as hard woods, which have been put upon the free list—lignum vitae and all those woods—coming into the United States in a polished condition, when partially manufactured, that then they shall have an additional duty of 5 per cent ad valorem. That is the whole purpose of that paragraph, and if it has any other purpose, or any other meaning, the committee have not yet been able to discover it.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say to the Senator in respect to that that I can not agree with him, but at all events it can be made clear and certain by excepting paragraphs 196 and 197.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to that.

Mr. NELSON. If that exception is made I shall be satisfied as to that paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. I thought it due to the committee that I should make an explanation about paragraph 196, that we intend to offer an amendment to make the meaning of that paragraph perfectly clear when it is reached in the Senate.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this hue and cry about the danger of Canadian competition is utterly groundless and hysterical. The Canadians, especially in British Columbia, are in mortal terror of our competition, as the following resolutions show:

COPY OF RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MOUNTAIN LUMBER MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, AT ANNUAL MEETING, NELSON, BRITISH COLUMBIA, JANUARY 29, 1909.

Whereas the lumber interests of British Columbia and western Canada are still suffering from the unfair competition of rough lumber coming into Canada free of duty;

Whereas railway companies are still placing orders for lumber on the American side, such railway companies having been heavily subsidized by the Canadian people, of which subsidies British Columbia has to pay her proportion;

Whereas large quantities of lumber are waiting sale and mills are idle, which lumber was produced with protected machinery and protected supplies;

Whereas the manufacturers of western Canada have to-day in stock as much lumber as they have ever marketed in the best year heretofore experienced and have increased their manufacturing capacity to such an extent that they are now able to supply at least three times greater in any one year that sold in the best year so far experienced, viz, 1906;

Whereas the Hon. Mr. Fielding assured the lumber manufacturers of this district some years ago that the dumping clause would give us ample protection from American lumber, which is not the case, for the reason that during the past eighteen months the American market has been so demoralized that their mills have been selling lumber for less than two-thirds of its cost, and consequently exporters to Canada are willing to make affidavits that the price at which they are dumping lumber into this country is the fair market value if sold for home consumption;

Whereas the mills of this district were unable to operate one-fourth of their ten-hour capacity during 1908, throwing out of work thousands of men and causing millions of dollars of invested capital to remain unproductive;

Whereas owing to our excessive capacity to produce lumber it is important to preserve to Canadian mills our entire market;

Whereas the product of the Mountain mills is from 75 to 85 per cent common lumber, the unfairness should be manifest of allowing American mills to dump into Canada their surplus low-grade material, which represents by far the largest portion of our output;

Whereas the most vital industry in the welfare of this province is the only great industry on the American Continent which is not afforded reasonable protection, and as there seems to be no just grounds to continue to sacrifice our interests;

It is therefore resolved, That the Dominion government be urged to give this matter prompt investigation for the purpose of verifying the claims advanced in this petition, and to place a duty of \$2 per M on rough fir, cedar, spruce, larch, and pine lumber, and of 30 cents per M on shingles, at the earliest possible date.

OTTO LACHMUND, President.
W. A. ANSTIE, Secretary.

Mr. President, I have occupied the time of the Senate longer than I intended. That is always the case where one is subject to interruptions. I started out with a view of limiting myself by saying that I would decline to yield. But Senators feel they have a right to ask questions and I have felt that it was hardly proper for me to refuse to yield for that purpose.

I am thankful for the indulgence that has been shown me. When we afterwards come to this schedule I may perhaps go into it a little further, but I think I have satisfied every fair-minded Senator here, whether he is the most radical protectionist or otherwise, that there ought not to be a higher rate of duty on dressed and planed lumber than on the rough lumber.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I do not intend at this time to discuss the lumber schedule. I want to refer to what I consider some mistakes made by the Senator from Minnesota in the very able speech he has just made. As far as I can learn, there is no lumber trust in this country. As I am informed, the large holders of timber do not own more than 3 per cent of the timber lands of the United States. This is the result of my investigation on the subject, and I state as a fact that timber lands are no more held by a trust or combination than farm lands.

The business of lumbering is of a temporary nature, and the people who enter into it are entitled, if they can make it, to a reasonable profit. Of late years I believe that the lumber interests of the country have made some profit, and for my part I am glad they have.

But, Mr. President, there is another feature. The expenses of making lumber are much greater than in the ordinary occupations; of late timber lands have increased from \$5 to \$30 per acre and the item of interest is considerable. The wages are higher than in many other industries, and range from \$2 up to \$7 a day. There is the renewal of the mills. There is also the improved machinery which must be bought and which must be taken into account. All these and other items enter into the cost of lumber. Then, again, railroad rates on lumber have been higher in the last ten years.

The Senator from Minnesota said he took his text from a statement made by the President in New York, with which I am heartily in accord. I want to call his attention, however, to the fact that this is a bill, among other things, to “equalize duties.” This is the second purpose of the bill. In his State the farmers own and enjoy not for one, two, or three years, but, I hope, for a long number of years, for hundreds of years, a soil that yields large and profitable returns; and these farmers have been highly prosperous for the past ten years under the present tariff, and I rejoice that they have, and under the present bill the duties on their products have in some cases been increased. Let me read the list of the chief products of the Senator's State and the duties on the same. Standing at the head of this list is wheat, on which there is 30 cents a bushel; on vegetables, 40 per cent ad valorem; on corn, 25 per cent ad valorem; on barley, 30 cents per bushel; on cattle, \$2 a head; on meat, 25 per cent ad valorem; on beef, 2 cents a pound; on cabbage, I do not know whether the Senator's State produces cabbage, but the duty is 3 cents a head; on hay there is a duty of \$4 a ton; on flax, \$5 a ton; and on oats, 20 cents a bushel. These products all have a duty, some of them a high duty. I fail to find any product on the free list.

Mr. President, these are the chief articles the State of Minnesota produces, and they enjoy liberal protection. Therefore, I think, if duties are to be equalized—in other words, if there is to be a fair revision of the tariff—the duty on these products might be reduced and lumber not be made free. On the basis of equalizing duties, the great lumber industry of the country ought to receive some protection and not be made free. This would not be equalizing duties and would not be fair. As lumber stands in the bill now, the duty of \$1 per thousand is equal to about 5 or 6 per cent ad valorem. Under the Dingley law it was about 12 per cent, and was reduced one-half. That is lower by one-half than the duties upon the products of the State of Minnesota. Why should the products of the State of Minnesota be favored with protection and high duties, while the products of my State are made free?

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ELKINS. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. Has the Senator heard any insistence upon the part of the Senators from Minnesota for a tariff upon those products of that State at the rate reported by the committee? The attitude of the Senators from Minnesota will be that all these duties should be placed at a point where they will fairly, and no more than fairly, amount to a protection upon a given commodity. I think I can voice the sentiment of my colleague

when I say that we do not ask for any 30 cents a bushel upon wheat. We expect, when it is reached, that the duty upon wheat will be dealt with as we desire to deal with the duties upon other commodities, namely, put to a point where it will have only no more than reasonable protection.

I do not intend that those who are insisting upon raising the duties in the bill in other sections shall do it upon the theory that they have thrown us the proposition of 30 cents a bushel upon wheat when we know and they know that no such duty as that on wheat is needed.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I have not heard that the Senators from Minnesota have protested against the high duties reported in the bill on the products of their State. Now, I should like to ask the Senator, because I may be in error, if he advocates free lumber? I supposed his colleague favored free lumber, but I was very glad to hear him say at the end of his admirable speech that he would agree to a rate of \$1 on a thousand feet, and if the mistake, as he supposed it was, on dressed lumber or finished lumber was agreed to, that would be satisfactory. This statement gave me great pleasure. Now, I ask the junior Senator if he is for free lumber or against free lumber, because I believe him to be a protectionist.

Mr. CLAPP. As a friend of the protected industries of this country, I would reduce the rate upon every article to the point of fair protection. As I understand the lumber question to-day, I have not observed for five years that the duty on lumber bore any relation whatever to its price, its protection or its reduction, and two years ago the duty could have been taken off without any serious opposition from the lumbermen. Believing that, I should vote, in the first place, to put lumber on the free list. If that could not be accomplished, I should vote to place a flat rate of \$1 a thousand on lumber, on the dressed as well as the rough. If that could not be accomplished, I would then try to get some reduction on lumber and some reduction upon every other item in this bill that will bring it to a fair protective basis.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] is not as liberal toward the products of my State as is his colleague [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. FLINT. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question. I want to ask the Senator if it can be shown from the testimony that the difference in the price of labor in Canada and in the United States makes it necessary to have a duty of \$2 on lumber to equalize conditions in this country with those in Canada, whether he would vote for a duty of \$2?

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, if it cost me my seat in this Senate I would not consciously vote to strike down a single American industry. I would not limit the inquiry to whether there could be shown a difference. I believe, sir, we have a right to take into consideration our general knowledge and observation of the condition of these various industries; that we have a right to take into account the question of the relative importation as against domestic production as to whether a tariff is necessary or not necessary. If I did become convinced that a \$2 duty was necessary on lumber or a \$7 duty was necessary on steel rails, I would vote for that duty if it retired me to private life.

I will say the same of the products of the South and of the East. When I get to it, I propose to show, or to try to show, that in a spirit of fairness, lifting ourselves above the frenzy of this occasion, which by our own delay in initiating progressive legislation we have brought upon us, we should calmly look over this entire subject and bring to our aid our general knowledge and observation of how these various industries have prospered, how they have resisted the foreign importation with present duties, as bearing upon the practical effect of a reduction of those duties, and then, whether it be the sugar of the South, the lumber of the South, or the textiles of the Northeast, or the crops of the Northwest, try to reach a duty with reference to every one of these things that will be fair to those industries, and fair, not upon the theory that in fostering an industry we only help the men engaged in that industry, but that in giving those men remunerative wages, we are fostering and aiding all the industries and all the productive faculties of this country.

I have been obliged, sir, by the question of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] to somewhat extend my remarks beyond the mere "yes" or "no" answer to a categorical question, and he must pardon me for this intrusion upon his time.

Mr. ELKINS. I will pardon the Senator this time.

Mr. President, the Senator has just stated that he was going to be just and fair, and, from his known ability and character for fairness and square dealing, I believe he will. But, Mr. President, the Senator is too general in his statement. Burke says generalities prove nothing. This is true, and when I

put to the Senator the categorical question, Is he for free lumber? in his reply he does not seem to be so clear and fair. In his generalities he was very fair.

Now, I want to ask the Senator what rate of duty would he agree to on wheat?

Mr. CLAPP. I think—

Mr. ELKINS. Are you for free wheat?

Mr. CLAPP. No.

Mr. ELKINS. Are you for free barley?

Mr. CLAPP. No.

Mr. ELKINS. Are you in favor of a 50 per cent reduction on the barley rate?

Mr. CLAPP. I think a reduction of duty from 25 cents to 20 cents would be abundant upon wheat. I may differ in that respect from other Senators from wheat-raising regions of the country. I will, however, discuss my relation to each one of these schedules when we get to the individual schedule. I believe that the duties in nearly all of them ought to be reduced.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. McCUMBER. While the Senator from West Virginia is discussing and answering questions about the comparative tariffs on different articles, I ask him how the tariffs on different agricultural products measure up in percentages with the tariff on iron manufactures of different kinds in the United States?

Mr. ELKINS. I think that 30 cents a bushel on wheat is a high duty, a long way higher than free wheat.

Mr. McCUMBER. On wheat worth \$1.25 a bushel?

Mr. ELKINS. It is 25 per cent.

Mr. McCUMBER. That would not be 20 per cent.

Mr. ELKINS. About 20 per cent.

Mr. McCUMBER. But you have got articles here that go up to even 40 and 50 per cent.

Mr. ELKINS. Barley is up to about 70 cents now.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let us suppose it is 25 per cent. I am asking the Senator generally how this compares with the tariffs on manufactured goods that are made in the State of West Virginia? That is, merely a general statement. I do not suppose the Senator can give particularly just what they would be.

Mr. ELKINS. Probably on the manufactured articles that we produce they might be fair, but I want to ask the Senator this question: Why is it he stands here and advocates free lumber and asks for high duties on the products of his State?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am mighty glad the Senator from West Virginia asks me that question, because I can answer it. We can raise a bushel of barley this year, we can raise it again next year, and we can raise it the year after, but you can not raise a hundred-year-old tree in a year. When you cut down that hundred-year-old tree, you can not produce it again for another hundred years. If you can establish the fact that you can produce that tree year after year, you will get as strong a protection as I am capable of giving it.

I want to say further to the Senator that a tax upon lumber to-day is a duty paid by the consuming public for the extinction of the American forests. The very principle—if the Senator will allow me to go one step further—of your protection is that we may develop the industry. Can you develop the industry of lumber in this country when, at the present rate, even the most extreme will say that you will exhaust the lumber supply in less than thirty years, and the chances are that with the development of the population in this country, with its increase, you will, in less than twenty years, denude every forest in this country that is not held by the strong arm of the Government. I can see the difference between an ear of corn that you may raise this year and a tree that it takes all the way from one hundred to two hundred years to raise.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. ELKINS. I will, provided the Senator is not going to make a speech.

Mr. GALLINGER. I never make speeches.

Mr. ELKINS. I will not trust the Northwest to ask a question any more. [Laughter.] They are given too much to oratory and speeches.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to say, in response to a suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], that when he says that a duty on lumber is going to destroy our forests and that free lumber is going to preserve them, he puts himself in direct antagonism to the views of Mr. Pinchot, of the forester of my own State, and of the forestry experts throughout the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. And in direct harmony with many other experts.

Mr. GALLINGER. And then, again, I want to suggest that I think the fact that they can raise a crop of wheat or a crop of barley every year in North Dakota is no reason why it should be protected as against lumber, which can not be produced every year. I think we ought to protect the industry that has got to struggle through a hundred years to produce a tree.

Mr. ELKINS. The Senator from New Hampshire has answered the Senator from North Dakota very well and properly. The contention of the Senator from North Dakota is that because the lumber industry, although valuable, one of the leading industries of the United States, and especially of the South, must disappear, in the nature of things, probably in one hundred years or two hundred years—and that is dependent on whether we plant or replant and restore our forests—that because of its temporary character and because of its infirmity in this regard it must not be taxed, but must be free. The money which is invested in timber lands and the lumber industry is just as sacred as the money which is invested in your farm and is entitled to as much consideration. Because you probably exhaust one before the other is no reason why it should be treated differently, unjustly, and unfairly. Because the forests may be exhausted is no argument why the great lumber industry of the country should not be treated as fairly as the products of other States. Let me say to the Senator, following the experience of other States—New York, Ohio, and others I might name—some day the soil of his State will be exhausted and not produce wheat and barley. Is this a good reason why wheat and barley should not be treated as liberally as other products? In time everything will fail, and therefore we should not take care of the present and provide for the future?

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator permit me to ask him one question right there?

Mr. ELKINS. Is it a question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; a question.

Mr. ELKINS. Very well.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator believe that with the rate of consumption, say, 5 per cent yearly of our lumber, the price is going down? If we are exhausting it at that rate, will not the price be bound to go up, tariff or no tariff?

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, suppose the price does go up. Does not the price of the land in his State go up every year, and will not these same lands be exhausted and fail to produce?

Mr. GALLINGER. And of wheat.

Mr. ELKINS. And wheat is going up, and going up because we are going to produce less wheat and not enough soon for our own supply. So, there is no argument in that. The argument is absurd, if the Senator will allow me to say it, that just because here is an industry which has \$600,000,000 invested in it and employs 600,000 people in the United States, which may pass away soon, or within fifty years or a hundred years, or is passing away, that it must not have the benefit of protection the same as other industries and products. And yet the Senator claims to be a protectionist. Tried by his own rule, is he a sound protectionist?

Mr. GALLINGER. It employs 800,000 people.

Mr. ELKINS. Yes. That argument will not do. I am willing to extend to the Senator's State reasonable protection upon every product which they produce; but why can not the Senator be as liberal toward industries of other sections and other States as he is to his own? The Senator wants this duty of 30 cents per bushel on wheat; he wants a duty of 30 cents on barley. They are the highest kind of protected industries in his State; yet he is unwilling to grant the same protection to other States. I submit to him whether that is fair and just, and whether this is equalizing duties and a fair revision of the tariff. I am opposed to duties and protection in spots. All American industries should be treated fairly. This can not be done by protecting some and putting others on the free list. There is enough money to be raised for the needs of the Government if the duties are laid and distributed justly to protect every American industry needing protection. We can never make a tariff if we protect the industries and products of some States and put the products of others on the free list.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator will excuse me. We are going to vote for 60 and 70 per cent upon your iron manufactures.

Mr. ELKINS. But not upon our lumber.

Mr. McCUMBER. No.

Mr. ELKINS. We are discussing lumber now. When we come to iron we will discuss that. Why can you not agree to the 5 per cent ad valorem, if you please, which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] is willing to allow on lumber. I understand that his colleague is willing to allow a duty of \$1 on a thousand feet.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will answer that, if the Senator asks me the question. I will never vote to give \$1 to protect the lumber industry in the United States and then tax the people \$10 to reforest the country. That is the reason.

Mr. ELKINS. I do not believe the Senator ever will, Mr. President. He need not argue that feature of it any further. I think he is committed to unadulterated free trade in the things which his State does not produce. That is what I believe about his attitude, and he need not argue that question with me any further.

I have, however, not quite finished with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], who made a speech in my time.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will find one thing outside of those articles that I will vote for and will not vote for as strong a protection as is necessary, then I will yield that his position is correct.

Mr. ELKINS. I do not know what this everlasting prejudice that the Senator has against the lumber industry means. I do not know what the lumber industry has done to him; perhaps something which we can not understand. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. ELKINS. Just for a question?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Just for a question.

Mr. ELKINS. I am not discussing this schedule at this time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the Senator from West Virginia claim that the tariff in the pending bill upon rough lumber and upon finished lumber represents the difference in the cost of production, including labor in lumber in Canada, where the chief competition is, and the United States?

Mr. ELKINS. I believe it approximates it, but I believe that labor is cheaper in Canada than it is in the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has the Senator any figures or statistics to establish that claim?

Mr. ELKINS. Yes, sir; I have them in the hearings before the House; but I will not take the time of the Senate now to read them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to hear them.

Mr. ELKINS. The Senator from Minnesota, in making his speech, quoted from the House hearings the testimony of one witness. I want to call his attention and that of the Senator from North Dakota to pages 2902, 2922, 2949, 2960, 2966, and 2976 of the House hearings, all contradicting the theory of the Senator from Minnesota and many of the alleged facts stated in this debate by the free-lumber advocates.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the Senator permit one other question?

Mr. ELKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the minimum wage that the hearings before the House committee show to be paid anywhere in lower Canada or in British Columbia for labor?

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I know that Japanese labor, cooly labor, Hindoo labor, and the labor generally of Canada is lower than that of the United States. Right here I happen to open these hearings as to the average wage paid by the mills of some lumber company. I do not know where the mills are located, but the wages in the United States are from \$2 to \$7 a day. Now, there may be for skilled labor in some of the mills in Canada high wages, but the wages of labor is cheaper there than here. That goes without saying.

Mr. President, I did not want to precipitate any debate upon this question at this time. We know the effects of free lumber in the United States, because we have tried it. As a fellow said once: "Honesty is the best policy." He had tried both sides. [Laughter.] If we had not tried free lumber and experienced all of its disastrous effects, I would not be so confident.

Mr. McLaurin. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ELKINS. I thought he was my friend and would not make a speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. McLaurin. I certainly am a friend of the Senator from West Virginia, but there is a little matter that distresses my mind about this labor subject that I would like to have the Senator from West Virginia explain. As to the cooly labor, of which he has spoken, of course it can not come across to this country, and there can not be any great amount of such laborers in Canada. If right across the line in Canada labor is so much cheaper than it is right across the line in the United States, how is it that those Canadian laborers do not come over here and labor where they can get so much better wages? I would like to have that explained. I am not a protectionist; but I should like to understand that.

Mr. ELKINS. We get a great number of our low priced wage-earners from Canada.

Mr. McLAURIN. I did not catch the answer of the Senator.

Mr. ELKINS. We get a great many wage-earners from Canada to work in our country, especially in the lumber plants.

Mr. McLAURIN. Would not that strip the Canadian mills altogether?

Mr. ELKINS. They get American wages when they get here. We do not pay them Canadian wages. They would not take them; they know too much for that. If they were content with Canadian wages, they would not come to the United States.

Mr. McLAURIN. It would seem that some Americans are going to Canada.

Mr. ELKINS. I never heard of one going to Canada, England, Belgium, or Italy. No; the Senator knows they do not go that way.

Mr. McLAURIN. The Senator does not know that.

Mr. ELKINS. They come this way.

Mr. McLAURIN. I see in papers published up in that section of the country articles saying that there are thousands, many thousands—

Mr. ELKINS. Going to Europe?

Mr. McLAURIN. No; going into Canada from this country. They may be Republican papers and not reliable, but I have read such statements in the papers.

Mr. ELKINS. They are farmers and go to take up farms there.

Mr. McLAURIN. I have read that they go up there to work in the mills.

Mr. ELKINS. No. I should like, if the Senator can find an instance of that kind that is authentic, to refer me to it.

Mr. McLAURIN. I think I may find one of them up there without a search warrant.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from West Virginia will permit me, I have some knowledge on this subject. Americans are going to British Columbia to take up farms. They have gotten rich in Iowa, Minnesota, and Nebraska because they took up land at \$1.25 an acre which is now worth from \$75 to \$100. But now they are selling it and going over to Canada, where they can buy virgin land for from \$8 to \$10 an acre. It is a good business proposition. Now, the Senator suggests that if labor is cheaper in Canada than in this country it is rather remarkable that Canadians do not come to this country to find work. New England is flooded with Canadian laborers in our forests, in our mills, in our brickyards, in all our industries, and they come there because they get better wages than they get in Canada. Immediately after they come across the line they demand American wages.

Mr. McLAURIN. For whom do they work when they come over from Canada?

Mr. GALLINGER. In our mills, in our forests, in our brickyards.

Mr. McLAURIN. As I understand, the tariff is for the purpose of protecting the laborers and to give them better wages. I have never heard anybody advocate a tariff to benefit the man who gets the money from the tariff. I have been here for some time and I have yet to hear any protective-tariff man advocate a protective tariff to give it to the man who gets it, but it is always for the benefit of labor. Now, do not those laborers who come across into this country and who are employed by these protected industries come in competition with labor that is already here?

Mr. GALLINGER. They do not, because we need additional labor.

Mr. McLAURIN. Well—

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes. Has the Senator grasped the idea? Does it penetrate his mind?

Mr. McLAURIN. Is it not a fact, Mr. President, that the mere labor you have the cheaper the labor is?

Mr. GALLINGER. Not always.

Mr. McLAURIN. If two laborers are running after one employer, it makes labor cheaper than for—

Mr. GALLINGER. That is not true under Republican administration in New England.

Mr. McLAURIN. A Republican administration probably reverses all the rules of arithmetic and economy, but my understanding is that two laborers running after one employer make labor cheap; but if two employers run after one laborer, it makes labor high.

Mr. GALLINGER. That was under the Wilson tariff law.

Mr. McLAURIN. The Wilson tariff did not produce the panic of 1893; that was under the McKinley tariff.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. McLAURIN. The Senator is not mistaken about that. The Senator may be mistaken about things that he reads in

Republican newspapers on the borders of Canada, but he is not mistaken as to things that occur in current history that he knows something about.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from New Hampshire is going to protect himself to the extent of saying that he is not deluded by what he reads in the Democratic newspapers on the borders of Canada or anywhere else.

Mr. McLAURIN. If Republicans would read Democratic papers and believe them more, it would be better for the interests of the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. ELKINS. Now, Mr. President, I want to finish.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me for a moment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. ELKINS. I shall have to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. This seems to be an experience meeting. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he is still for a duty on lumber or for free lumber?

Mr. McLAURIN. I am not for any protective duty on lumber. I will state to the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, if you undertake to raise the tariff on lumber above the rate in the House bill I will vote against it, and I shall not say that I will not vote against free lumber.

Mr. ELKINS. I was going to ask the Senator that question, but I was a little afraid, because I did not want him to commit himself. I am laboring with him and trying to get him to agree to at least \$1 a thousand, not that I am willing to compromise on a dollar, but I thought if we start in at that figure it would be a good thing to do. I am for the present duty of \$2 a thousand feet. It is just and fair, and it is a low duty, about 12 per cent, especially when the average of duties in this bill is from 44 to 45 per cent. Why not cut down some of the high duties instead of maintaining them and putting some products on the free list? Let all products have some duties.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ELKINS. Certainly.

Mr. McLAURIN. While I do not want to compromise with the Senator, I want to know something definite.

Mr. ELKINS. We better not compromise here in the open Senate. We will talk out in the hall. [Laughter.]

Mr. McLAURIN. Let us talk it right here, where everybody can hear it. I have been told by Senators who advocate a duty of \$2 a thousand on lumber that that is only 12 per cent ad valorem. I never would consent to go above a dollar a thousand. I would not consent to give any higher duty on dressed lumber than I would on rough lumber. Mr. President, if \$2 a thousand is 12 per cent ad valorem, \$1 a thousand would be 6 per cent ad valorem. Now, let us agree upon a bill that will make it 6 per cent ad valorem on lumber.

Mr. ELKINS. I would not agree because it is not in my hands; and I look toward my friend, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman of the committee. We are not through with this question and many other questions. We have got a month to talk about this and other items.

Mr. McLAURIN. The Senator from Rhode Island does not represent West Virginia, I hope.

Mr. ELKINS. I am trying to do that.

Mr. McLAURIN. I say the Senator from Rhode Island does not.

Mr. ELKINS. No; and he does not elect me and my colleague to the Senate. [Laughter.] He does nearly everything else.

Mr. McLAURIN. Let the Senator from West Virginia and myself agree on an ad valorem duty of 6 per cent.

Mr. ELKINS. I would rather say twelve.

Mr. GALLINGER. Would the Senator make the same proposition in regard to rice?

Mr. McLAURIN. Let us cut down the duty on rice one-half, if the Senator wants.

Mr. GALLINGER. Why not 6 per cent on rice?

Mr. McLAURIN. The present and proposed tariff on rice is 2 cents a pound. Let us cut it down to 1 cent. The Senator can not strike at me on that.

Mr. ELKINS. If I could agree with the Senator on 12 per cent ad valorem, I would do so. That is just what it is in the Dingley law.

I want to conclude what I have to say. I want to cite the experience of West Virginia and sections of the country with which I am familiar when we had the Wilson bill and free lumber. I state it as a fact that free lumber under the Wilson bill closed 90 per cent of our mills and the grass grew in the roads leading up to them; and in the New York markets they took Canadian lumber to build grain elevators and supply the

general market there that West Virginia before and under the McKinley bill was furnishing. That is an actual fact.

There is another feature about this free-lumber proposition. Already alert American capitalists are buying timber lands in Mexico and getting ready to build railroads to bring lumber into the United States. They have bought lands for \$2 an acre, some for a dollar and less, and are waiting for lumber to be put on the free list. They have got their friends here now working for free lumber, and there are some timber owners from Canada, too, wanting and working for free lumber. Why? Because then they can carry on the lumber business profitably in Mexico and Canada, having cheap lands and low wages. These are the dangers that surround us, the breaking down of a great and leading industry of this country by the reduction of the duty on lumber or putting it on the free list.

Mr. SCOTT. Will my colleague allow me to ask him a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the senior Senator from West Virginia yield to the junior Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. ELKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCOTT. I wanted to ask my colleague if the duty were taken off of lumber whether or not it would result in one farthing of reduction to the consumer? For my part, I do not believe it would ever reach the consumer at all. We had a great man once in this country, who said the tariff question was a local question, and from the discussion here to-day and that which we shall undoubtedly have, it strikes me it is very local. It is a little like Artemus Ward, who, when asked where was the best place to have a boil, replied on one of his wife's relations. That is the way with Senators in this Chamber. They are willing to reduce the tariff on everything that somebody else has, but they are not willing to reduce the tariff on their own manufactures or on articles produced in their own States.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I have nothing more to say at this time. When the time comes to discuss the lumber schedule, I am going to discuss it at length.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, just a word. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], who made a most admirable speech on the wrong side of the question, to the fact that while finished lumber can be conveyed to Minnesota perhaps for less than unfinished lumber, as I understand very little unfinished lumber does go into Nebraska, Minnesota, and other States in that region.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say that over 90 per cent of the lumber we buy is dressed lumber.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. And very little rough lumber is used.

Mr. GALLINGER. I agree to that. I presume that is so; but I wanted to call the Senator's attention to the fact that he is much farther away from the source of supply than some of the rest of us. The States of New England, New York, and other States bordering on Canada do not have to pay such high rates for transportation. It would be very unjust to us if the finished lumber was simply sent across the border and the duty on it was no more than on the unfinished lumber. So that there is a little difficulty there, but perhaps it can be adjusted.

Mr. NELSON. Does not the Senator remember the trip he took with me to the reservoir and headwaters of the Mississippi, and did not he see the pine logs and timber we had there?

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, yes.

Mr. NELSON. We have it as near to us as you have it.

Mr. GALLINGER. You have some.

Mr. NELSON. We have a good deal.

Mr. GALLINGER. But you are more dependent, of course, upon the supply from other parts of the country than we are. I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that there would be an injustice to the States bordering on Canada if the Senator's contention, that there should be no greater duty on the finished lumber than on the unfinished lumber, should prevail. Perhaps it is a matter that can be adjusted; but there is some trouble along that line, and I wanted to put the statement in the Record.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I would like to say just a word, if my friend the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN] will permit me, in commendation of the spirit which he shows upon the lumber schedule. Now, I understand that the Senator is willing to vote for a duty of 6 per cent on lumber for the general purpose of equalizing conditions between the lumber producers in Michigan and those in Canada.

Mr. McLAURIN. I ought to be permitted to state my own position on that.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is what I understood.

Mr. McLAURIN. Any duty that I will vote for will be a revenue duty only. I am not a protectionist in any sense. I never have believed, I do not believe now, and I hope I never will believe that it is just or fair to take by tariff law one man's money and give it to another.

Mr. ALDRICH. But being in favor of a revenue duty on lumber, he desires, I assume, in the interest of the people of the State he represents, that the revenue duty should be equal to the difference in conditions between Canada and his own people.

Mr. McLAURIN. I never have thought of the question about equalizing the difference between the price of an article from a foreign country and in this except for this purpose, and that is for the purpose of ascertaining how much of the commodity or article will likely be imported into this country under that particular rate of duty and how much revenue will be derived by the Government therefrom.

Mr. ALDRICH. But if the Senator thought that a pure revenue duty of 6 per cent would be fair to the lumbermen of Mississippi and would allow them to go on and do their business without hindrance, and that a duty of 5 per cent would be destructive of the interests of the lumber people of Mississippi, that it would subject them to unfair competition with the lumbermen of Canada, for instance, would he vote for 5 or for 6 per cent?

Mr. McLAURIN. As I have just said and tried to make myself understood by the Senator from Rhode Island, it never enters into my mind when I am voting on a question of tariff what effect it will have, excepting in the production of revenue. It has never occurred to me that any tariff duty ought to be for the purpose of making any consumer pay a higher price for anything he purchases. I do not think it is right. I never have thought it was right.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. McLAURIN. If the Senator will allow me, before I conclude, so far as concerns the people of the State of Mississippi and the lumber mills there, I do not believe a duty of \$1 or \$2 a thousand on lumber would ever affect the mills or the consumers of lumber in the State of Mississippi. The railroad rates on lumber from Mississippi, and especially from the section of Mississippi where the lumber is principally produced, to Chicago is so high that you might put \$2 or \$2.50 or \$3 a thousand on lumber and the mills of Mississippi, although our lumber is superior to almost any other lumber, could not pay the freight and compete with the Canadian lumber or with the people in that section.

The lumber from Mississippi is principally shipped to foreign countries. It is shipped to Germany, to South Africa, to South America, to Mexico, and to other foreign countries. It goes by the million from Gulfport, Pascagoula, Biloxi, Bay St. Louis, and other points on the coast of Mississippi to foreign countries for the reason that I have stated, that the rates on the railroads are so high that it can not be shipped in competition with Canada; and no amount of tariff that has ever been laid on lumber could cut the Canadian competition from our people, because if you could have free lumber, the Canadian people could not compete with the sawmills of the State of Mississippi, in the southern part of the State where pretty nearly all the sawmills are.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from Mississippi was considering revenue alone, \$2 a thousand on lumber has produced \$4,000,000 of revenue. One dollar a thousand, which he says he is for, will produce \$2,000,000 of revenue, unless the importations should increase. It would require twice as many imports, of course, at \$1 a thousand as at \$2 a thousand to raise the same amount of revenue.

I imagine the Senator from Mississippi does not consider that desirable, because whatever may be done with Mississippi lumber, at some point it comes in competition with Canadian lumber, perhaps not directly, but the territory which will be reached by Mississippi's lumber would be restricted if the importations were doubled from Canada into this country. So if a pure revenue question was considered, it seems to me the Senator from Mississippi ought to be for \$2 a thousand.

I said that I wanted to commend the spirit of the Senator from Mississippi. I believe the Southern States have already entered upon an era of development and prosperity which will surprise the world; and, as far as I am concerned, in every vote I give upon this bill I intend to do everything I can as a legislator to encourage and increase that degree of prosperity and development to which I have alluded.

I am glad to see that Senators upon the other side recognize this fact and are willing to cooperate with us in giving such protection—I care not what you call it—such encouragement, if you please, to this development as will make your country

what it ought to be, a country which will blossom as the rose compared with the wilderness which existed there twenty-five years ago.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Rhode Island can ever convince me that the best revenue duty for lumber is 12 per cent instead of 6 per cent, I will always favor that which is the best, fairest, and just revenue-producing rate. The Senator has taught me that often a reduction of the tariff rate increases the revenue. I hope the Senator will give attention to what I am going to say now, because if he is a friend of the South—and I believe he is a friend of the South—

Mr. ALDRICH. I am.

Mr. McLAURIN. I believe it, because I believe he is a friend to the whole country, I believe he is a patriot, and I take his word when he says so. I want to say to the Senator right here, if he wants to benefit the South, he can do so by changing this bill so as to take off what he says is not only a protective duty, but is a prohibitive duty, on cotton-seed oil, for it can do us no good at all; take it off the dutiable list and put it on the free list, and then give us instead of that, not a tariff to protect any of our products, but take off of us the heavy hand of a tariff that robs one of our products; give us free bagging and ties in place of it. We will swap you the duty on cotton-seed oil, and let that be put upon the free list, for free bagging and ties.

Our cotton producers are not benefited in any particular by any tariff. You can not benefit them by a tariff on cotton-seed oil. You can not benefit them in any way by a tariff, because a tariff on cotton could not help our cotton-producing people, for the reason that there is no appreciable amount of cotton raised in any other part of the world. The cotton of the world is raised in the South. Why put upon the people who raise that cotton a tax of four, or five, or six million dollars a year in the way of a tariff upon bagging and ties? Give us free bagging and ties if you want to help the South, and that will leave in the hands of the producers of it the money they have produced; and that is all we ask with reference to cotton.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the discussion of the lumber schedule has brought forth certain statements which I think should be emphasized for the special consideration of the Senators who feel that the House rates on finished lumber should be maintained as reported. I am one of those who in this Chamber voted, in 1897, for a \$1 duty on lumber. I believed at that time in the forecasts then made that the white-pine lumber would be exhausted in the normal course of events, considering the consumption, within ten years. More than ten years have passed and yet the stock of white-pine lumber is not exhausted, but is apparently about as well proportioned to the needs of the country as it was at that time.

This fact has led me to view with much doubt the speculative forecasts with reference to the exhausting of the forest life of the country. In the midst of such pessimistic views we forget that the trees are always growing and that, happily, within the last few years the attention of the country has been properly directed not only to the preservation of the forests now existing, but to the expansion of forest growth.

I have been somewhat perplexed in considering the lumber schedule to reconcile the position of the Forestry Service with the interest of forest preservation. I concede that to me it is a paradox to say that we should appropriate \$5,000,000 annually to protect the forests and then place a duty of \$2 a thousand in the way of a premium on cutting the forests down. It may be susceptible of explanation. I only suggest that it is obscure as a proposition, in my mind, at this moment.

But I did not rise—

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CARTER. I yield with pleasure. I do not intend to make extensive remarks, but only wish to emphasize one point.

Mr. CLAPP. In regard to the fact that the pine has not been exhausted so rapidly as it was anticipated, I have made a considerable study of that question in looking into the growth of trees and the size of the logs that have been cut in Minnesota in the last ten or twelve years; and I am thoroughly satisfied that perhaps 50 per cent of all the timber that has been cut in Minnesota in ten years has grown from the seeds since they commenced logging in Minnesota, which accounts for the fact that we have not depleted the forests within the time that it was some years ago anticipated they would be. Of course that will not apply in the future if they go on with the same rapidity.

I simply made that suggestion because I thought it might be of interest, having really spent a good deal of time studying the time required for the growth of the trees and the character and size of the logs cut in the last few years.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota no doubt is correct, but in conflict, I submit, with the statement made some ten or twelve years ago when discussing the white-pine schedule in the present law. It was then asserted over and over again and, so far as I know, not challenged, that white pine would not reproduce itself; but that when the white pine was cut down a species of inferior growth would supplant it and the white pine cease to be a growth on that particular soil.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. CARTER. I will be glad to.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator is correct, but there is this qualification to it: The lumbermen, when they strip the land of timber, leave the tops and the refuse matter. A fire goes in and destroys the seed of the forests, and there being no trees to furnish seed for the future there grows up other stuff. That is true except in one little case, where the Government has a reservation and reserves 5 per cent of the standing trees for the purpose of seed, and they keep the fire out. But the lumbermen do not keep out the fire and do not leave any timber for seeding purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CARTER. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that in the last twelve years the change in the use of lumber has been very marked indeed. Twelve years ago white pine was used in almost every building from one end of this country to the other. Now, in many cases, other materials are substituted for it, and to-day they are not using white pine as they did at that time. That is one reason. There has been that change in the use of that particular class of lumber. We are using other material for which they used to take white pine.

Mr. CARTER. The explanations are instructive, but do not go directly to the point I desire very briefly to make.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, he states that white pine is as plentiful as ever. It is almost unobtainable in my part of the country. It has almost gone out of existence.

Mr. CARTER. It was unobtainable in New England—

Mr. LODGE. I do not mean for the purpose of cutting it; I mean, to buy it. It is not found in our market. Other woods have been forced into the market which we never had. There is no white pine to be had when one asks for it.

Mr. CARTER. It is a question of price; and let me make this suggestion on the subject—

Mr. LODGE. The price would not be higher unless it was scarcer.

Mr. CARTER. I do not know that that follows. I assert as a fact that there is no direct relation between the cost of producing a thousand feet of lumber in the State of Washington and the price at which the thousand feet of lumber is disposed of in the State of North Dakota. I do not think the lumbermen have made unconscionable profits; but for some reason, which, perchance, the Department of Justice should ascertain or, perchance, the state legislatures should reach by appropriate laws, there has been an abnormal increase in the retail price of lumber all over this country.

The Senator from Minnesota cited the case of two independent concerns, apparently, one doing business in Arkansas and the other doing business in St. Louis, 500 miles distant, and their selling prices were identical, and although the names of the companies are different and the localities supplied are different, the remoteness of each from the point of supply of rough lumber does not seem to be taken into account at all.

The lumber producer, the man who cut the saw log into lumber, is charged with the sins of those who retail the lumber in some combination to the actual consumer.

A lumberman in the western part of Montana took sufficient interest in this peculiar phase of the situation to send an observant man into North Dakota for the purpose of ascertaining, if he could, how it happened that lumber was selling at retail in North Dakota for more than double the cost at the mill and the freight added. He could not discover why it was, but he discovered that it was so, and that abnormal condition continues to this day. No tariff bill can correct any such combination as seems to have been formed by the jobbers who retail the lumber to the consumer. We can not reach that difficulty by a high tariff or a low tariff or no tariff. It is an abnormal and monstrous condition in the channels of trade, permitting individuals handling a commodity to make an unconscionable profit out of the mere handling of it.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator from Montana permit me?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. MONEY. I merely wish to say to the Senator right at this point that a few days ago the supreme court of Mississippi found a lumber trust, certain retail dealers in lumber in Mississippi, guilty of violating the law, and I presume that that combination extends elsewhere.

Mr. CARTER. It seems to be a disease universal over the country.

Mr. HEYBURN. I can add something perhaps to the information in regard to the reason why lumber is sold at what seems to be an abnormal price in the Dakotas. I inquired of a lumber dealer, selling there the products of the forests of Montana—because that is where he bought the lumber when the Dakota price seemed to be so much in excess of what lumber was selling for in Montana—why it was. He said:

We do not sell enough there to justify us in holding to the narrow margin of profit that they do in that country. We are compelled because of the smallness of the sales to make a larger profit.

And that was not very long ago.

Mr. CARTER. I am inclined to think that the volume of sales is greatly diminished by the extravagance of the prices demanded.

Mr. HEYBURN. That may be.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree perfectly with the Senator from Montana where the fault lies, and I want to state here that it is not only in lumber, but applies to every business in the United States. I hope some time during the discussion of the tariff question to have the people of the United States understand that the retailer of this country is making an unreasonable profit.

For instance, I have a case before me now where a manufacturer in the United States sells at wholesale razors at \$3.95 a dozen. They are wholesaled in St. Louis by the jobber at \$9. They are retailed for \$2 apiece. The manufacturer in this country gets only \$3.95 a dozen and the consumer pays \$2 apiece.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator from Montana just made what occurred to me to be a remarkable statement; and I want to be sure that I understand it. I understood him to say that investigation had proven to his satisfaction that Montana lumber in North Dakota was selling at a price which was more than double the total price at the mill, with freight added.

Mr. CARTER. I said the investigation had satisfied my informant, and I accept his statement as worthy of attention and belief.

But I desire to call the special attention of Senators interested in the high duty on lumber to the statements cited by the Senator from Minnesota from the letter of Mr. Scanlon, a copy of which I received. That statement was to this effect: That it does not cost more to surface lumber on four sides than it does to surface lumber on one side, and that statement is borne out by a recitation of the facts with reference to the process.

Mr. Scanlon says that in former times, with imperfect machinery, the boards passed through the planing mill once for each surface made; if it was to be surfaced on both sides, the plank must be passed through the machine twice; if it was to be surfaced on both sides and squared up on the ends or tongued and grooved, it formerly required four passages of the plank through the planer, whereas to-day, with perfected machinery, the plank is passed through the planing mill but once.

Mr. NELSON. That is true.

Mr. CARTER. And by that one passage it is surfaced on both sides, tongued and grooved, or finished, as may be desired.

If that statement conforms to or squares with the actual fact, it is obvious to my mind that the allowance of 50 cents per thousand for surfacing on one side and 50 cents for surfacing on the other and 50 cents for tonguing and grooving constitute a piling up of the rate to offset the cost of labor, when it is but a single act of pushing the plank through the mill in any one of the cases cited.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Will the Senator from Montana allow me just one word?

Mr. CARTER. I will be glad to.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say to the Senator that that statement is not correct in one sense. Lumber when it is surfaced on one side is usually surfaced in the width as it comes from the tree, as it is sawed. Lumber that is surfaced on one side and plowed and grooved is usually surfaced in boards that are cut about 3 inches wide or 4 inches wide for flooring. Therefore whilst it may be true, if you surface the lumber to its full width, that you can do that, when you rip

this lumber into boards and cut it into flooring widths, it takes three times as much time and labor to do it, probably, as it does to surface a board on one side as it comes from the log. I know something about it. I have had experience in the business. I have been in the business for thirty-nine years. The lumber that is surfaced on one side and plowed and grooved is lumber that is cut up into what you may say "strips," that go on floors; and it takes about three times as much labor as lumber that is surfaced on one side to the full width of the board. That is a fact which can not be gainsaid.

Mr. CARTER. The answer of the Senator from Maryland, based on his long experience, bears fruit to my endeavor to secure some light upon the statement of Mr. Scanlon.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me, I will say furthermore that if you surface it on four sides, even if you do not rip it, you can not surface it as cheap as you can on one side, because you can not put it through the machine with the same rapidity as you can when you surface it on one side.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Scanlon's letter, read by the Senator from Minnesota, seemed to apply to lumber cut into narrow strips in the South—in Louisiana. As I recall the statement, it was to the effect that the cost was somewhat greater in Louisiana, because the lumber was cut into these small strips, whereas in Minnesota broader or wider boards were surfaced. But in that relation the testimony of the Minnesota man is to the effect that the cost of tonguing and grooving in Louisiana in the narrow strips adds only about 2 cents per thousand feet to the surfacing of the raw board in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me, I will say that it increases the cost in proportion to the number of strips that you get out of the board. If you take a board that is 10 inches wide and rip it into three boards of 3 inches, you will take more than three times the labor, because you have the expense of ripping the lumber besides the expense of surfacing it and tonguing and grooving.

I make the assertion, further, that you can not run a board through a planer and tongue and groove it as fast as you can run it through a planer and surface it on one side. It is a different kind of work. The lumber that is tongued and grooved for flooring and partitions will cost three times as much as that you just run through the planer in its natural width and surface it on one side.

Mr. CARTER. This presents a direct issue between the Senator from Minnesota and the fact as stated by his correspondent and the statement made by the Senator from Maryland. The Senator from Maryland, through broad experience, alleges that the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota is inaccurate, and I am glad that the matter has reached this point of consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am not contradicting the Senator from Minnesota. I merely state what I know to be the fact. We all know that, as far as that goes, flooring or partitioning is in very narrow strips of from 2 to 3 inches, and we all know that when you rip that up you can put only one piece through at a time; you can not put the board through. You put it through as fast as you can on one side and tongue and groove it. We all know that if a rough board it takes three times as long to run it through the planer.

Mr. CARTER. Far be it from me to take issue with the statement of the Senator from Maryland. He has experience and I have not. I am glad, however, that this issue has been brought up for the benefit not only of the committee but of the Senate. If there is a difference of 50 cents per thousand in the process of planing on each side, of course the schedule as arranged in the House text is correct. If, however, as contended by the correspondent of the Senator from Minnesota, that statement is not correct, then of course this continual addition of 50 cents per thousand for each side planed, tongued, or grooved should be corrected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President—

Mr. CARTER. I will yield in just a moment. I wish to have it understood with both the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Minnesota that I do not understand that one Senator is contradicting the other. We are attempting in the course of a discussion here on a very important matter to elucidate the truth, to get at the facts; and the contribution of both Senators raises an issue that requires light on this subject.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator from Montana allow me to ask a question of the Senator from Maryland right there?

Mr. CARTER. I will yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator from Maryland a question. Here is a plain board as it comes from the saw, neither planed on the one side nor on the other. Here is another board that comes from the saw, and we will say it is planed on

one side. I want to ask the Senator if it costs 50 cents a thousand more to plane it on one side than the rough lumber costs?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that I do not know what it costs other people, but in the business I have been connected with it costs more than that.

Mr. McCUMBER. The average, as I get it—

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not mean just to run it through; but if you should handle the lumber, transport it to the planing mill, carry it through, and all that, it costs a good deal more than 50 cents a thousand to plane it.

Mr. McCUMBER. In all the great mills it is planed in the same mill. As it passes through the saw the same lumber is taken up and planed. It can be planed on one side or it can be planed upon two sides.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Does the Senator undertake to tell the Senate that you take green lumber from the saw and carry it through the planing mill at one and the same time?

Mr. McCUMBER. When I speak of its coming from the saw it is rough lumber—

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The lumber has to be carried to dry kiln and dried.

Mr. McCUMBER. But it is the same lumber that comes from the saw. It has not changed itself in any way, shape, or manner. It is the rough lumber when it comes from the saw. I put a straight proposition, and I did not try to mislead in the slightest way. It is the rough lumber that comes from the saw. What I want to know, admitting now that it goes into the kiln and is dried and the moisture is taken out of it, is whether it costs 50 cents more to plane it upon one side. The duty here is 50 per cent higher. Then I want to know if it costs another 50 cents a thousand to plane and edge. The bill here calls for another half dollar a thousand.

Then I want to know if it costs another 50 cents a thousand to run the other edge on. The bill here asks for another 50 cents a thousand. Then I want to know if it costs still another to plane the other side, making it in all \$2 a thousand more for planing.

The evidence I have is that the planing on one side will not average 15 cents a thousand more, and when you plane both sides practically at the same time the amount is still less in proportion; and when you tongue and groove it at the same time, as in this piece of lumber, the percentage is less. Of course it takes longer; it is slower perhaps as it goes through the planing mill, where you plane both sides, than if you planed one side; but the proposition I desire to make is that planing the whole four sides would not make a dollar's difference on the average, and here we are giving a difference of \$2 and \$2.50 and \$3 upon the average.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I should like to say to the Senator that I am satisfied he has seen very few lumber mills.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to say to the Senator that I have seen a great many of them and I have seen their workings.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say to the Senator that he is not posted as to the cost of manufacturing lumber.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to say that I take my figures as they are given here by the manufacturers of lumber themselves. A manufacturer of lumber has given me the figures upon every one of those articles.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. When the Senator says that lumber is brought from the saw and carried through the planer, and it ought to cost only about 15 cents a thousand to plane it instead of 50 cents, I do not think that he has accurate information.

I want to say that when lumber is manufactured from the saw that lumber has to be transported to a dry kiln. It is carried there and after it is put in there and dried it is piled. The planing mills are not located in sawmills. They are located at some distance from sawmills, and necessarily so. The lumber is then taken from those piles and loaded on cars or wagons, whatever it may be, and carried to the planing mill. I am speaking in the first place of lumber, dressed and sawed. There is the expense of taking it from the pile and carrying it to the planing mill; there is the expense of running it through the machinery. After that, there is the expense of taking it out and running it back again. If the Senator asserts that you can do that for 15 cents, I do not hesitate to say that he knows nothing about the business. I do not care who he is.

Now, in regard to tonguing and grooving and dressing lumber as it comes from the log, that is one proposition, but after the lumber is tongued and grooved and dressed on one side you have got to fit it for the purpose for which it is to be used. The lumber that is tongued and grooved and dressed on one side is used for flooring or wainscoting or something of that kind and is cut up into strips, as it were. Probably you run a 10-inch board through a planer. You cut that board up into three strips and you tongue and groove it afterwards. I say

it will cost three times as much to do it as to run the lumber through and dress it on one side. You have to put the lumber in a condition where it will sell, and the market requires that it shall be manipulated and manipulated in a way that costs this extra expense.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from North Dakota if I understand he takes issue with the witness cited by the Senator from Minnesota? I understood it to be the statement of Mr. Scanlon, whose letter was read by the Senator from Minnesota, that it did not cost any more to surface lumber on two sides and size and tongue and groove it than to run it through a planer and surface it on the one side. In cutting short, narrow strips, however, as in the case of the Louisiana lumber, it costs 48 cents a thousand more; possibly 49. Now, I understand the Senator from North Dakota to admit that it costs probably 15 cents a thousand additional to plane the respective sides. Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. McCUMBER. On the average, according to my information, it will cost, we will say, additional about 15 cents per thousand for the mere planing on one side; and the planing of all sides, the tonguing and grooving, at the greatest figure, would not reach above 50 cents. That 50 cents would be a very full estimate of the additional cost. The range is from 15 cents for the first to 50 cents for all the work that is done.

Mr. CARTER. That is, for planing both sides, squaring one, and tonguing and grooving the other?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes, sir.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me, I do not know what the conditions are in preparing lumber in the South, but I want to describe the modus operandi in our State. After the lumber is sawed, they "size" it, as they call it—they strip it up into proper sizes. Then they run it into the dryer; that is, if they want to plane it, where they dry it in order to make it easier for planing and in order to reduce the weight. Then they take it from the drier and they put it through the machine and plane it. There is an immense saving in the matter of freight by the mere drying and the operation of planing. When you come to the matter of planing the cost is not any bigger in one case than the other. There may be a little difference.

In the matter of stripping the lumber up from the size that it is originally cut in at the mill, they always size it as it is put through. They size ordinary boards when they saw them. Sometimes they can even do that in the same operation. In the most improved mills it is done in the operation of sawing. They size them and cut them up into the size they want.

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE].

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] in regard to the cost of planing lumber. He is right in regard to the lumber which they have at Baltimore; but if he will go into the northern country, he will find that the cheaper grades of lumber are oftentimes sawed and run through the planer, the planer standing exactly in front of the saw, and the green lumber is surfaced for what we call "siding."

This is especially true in regard to hemlock. It is also true in regard to what we call the "stock length" of spruce. It is run through a machine which surfaces it and tongues and grooves it at the same time. It goes directly into the stack and is air dried, and that drying is sufficient for the usual New England manufacturer.

I understand that in Baltimore they use a class of lumber which is stripped into 2, 3, and 4 inch strips, and in that case the statement is absolutely correct, I think, in regard to the expense. The expense of passing lumber through a machine is very large. You can not take up a thousand feet of lumber, which weighs from two to three thousand pounds, and move it from one to another without its costing more than 15 cents. You must add, of course, to the expense of running the board through the mill the cost of transporting it from the place where it is cut up to the machinery.

In our State our lumber is largely now, I am sorry to say, No. 2 siding. The flooring, which constitutes, perhaps, one-fifteenth of our lumber, is, as the Senator from Maryland suggests, transported to the dry kiln. After being dried it is brought back to the dressing machine and there it is planed or "planed and jointed" or "planed and matched," as the terms are. I do not understand that the planing of the two sides is much more expensive than the planing on one side, because the same machine is used. The process is a little slower in feeding through the machine and the cost is really but a trifle more.

The 15 cents a thousand proposition, I would say to the Senator from Maryland, is where the planer stands immediately in front of the saw and the lumber is run through the planer.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me, he is talking about something I know nothing about. I have seen a great many of the higher character of mills. I speak more particularly of the best. Of course, the Senator knows what they do at the North. I have seen mills that manufacture hundreds of thousands of feet, and I have never yet seen any mill where they had a planer following the sawing of the lumber and putting the lumber through the planer to plane. If that is done, it must be some lumber for very inferior purposes, for a purpose that probably amounts to very little. In the first place, you can not take lumber from a saw and dress it properly or with any degree of accuracy. Think of trying to put a piece of flooring through a planer right from the saw! It would be absolutely worthless. You would ruin the lumber. I have seen mills that cut hundreds of thousands of feet, but I have never seen a mill that took a board from a saw and carried it green through a planer. I have seen a great many, but I have never yet seen that. It is something I have to learn. I have no doubt it is true, if the Senator says so.

Mr. PAGE. I was not brought up in a sawmill, but I came pretty near it. I know that that is done to a very large extent.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I have never seen anything of that kind. It is something I have yet to learn.

Mr. PAGE. I want to say to the Senator from Maryland that the lumber in our section of the Union is now of a poorer character than it was twenty years ago, and a large per cent of that which is sawed in the State in which I live is used for the cheap class of siding and is dressed in the way described by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I think it is manifest to every Senator that the question of the necessity for adding 50 cents per thousand for planing on one side and 50 additional cents or a dollar for planing on two sides and \$1.50 per thousand where the lumber is tongued and grooved is a debatable question. I desire to vote, when this schedule is reached, for such duty as will make up the difference in the cost of labor employed in thus finishing lumber here and in the competing country. If it costs only 50 cents per thousand to plane, tongue, and groove, I shall not vote for \$1.50 per thousand for that purpose.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the Senator will permit me, I think I might give him some help at this particular point.

Mr. CARTER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I notice from the statement on page 24, in Schedule D, that under the old tariff sawed lumber at the old rate came in and paid a duty of \$1,718,679.33, and in quantity it amounted to 859,339.61 feet. When you compare that item of import with the very much smaller item, when planed on one side or on both sides, or grooved, it seems to me it is conclusive evidence of the disproportion and the unfair advantage that the old rate gives to the finished lumber, the planed lumber, and the tongued and grooved lumber, because when we come to those items, take, for instance, planed or finished on one side, the quantity imported is only 19,176.90 feet, and planed or finished on two sides, only 2,777.80 feet, and the duty is inconsequential.

The reduction seems to be on the rough lumber. The \$1 per thousand is on the rough lumber, not on the finished lumber.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator's view of the subject, I think, is pertinent. I desire to have it understood that those thoroughly familiar with the processes and cost of manufacture shall be prepared when this schedule is reached, to show what it costs to surface lumber on one side or on two sides, and to tongue and groove the lumber; and they can not certainly ask us to vote a duty exceeding the total cost of performing the work, assuming that it costs nothing to perform it elsewhere.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. CARTER. I shall be glad to finish just a sentence here, if the Senator from Nevada will permit me.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very well.

Mr. CARTER. There is another feature connected with the statement of the Senator from Minnesota which requires attention and which must be met. It is said that the process of planing reduces the weight of a thousand feet of lumber substantially one-seventh; or, in other words, where a thousand feet of lumber in the rough would weigh 2,800 pounds, a thousand feet of the same lumber when planed and surfaced properly will weigh 400 pounds less. The Senator avers that the freight is levied or the tariff is fixed by the pound, and that no difference is made in the charge for carrying a finished pound over the rate charged for carrying a pound in the rough.

The average cost probably of transporting lumber from the mill to the point of consumption in this country would be a little less, say, than \$7 per thousand. If a thousand feet of finished lumber can be transported for \$6 where it costs \$7 to transport

the rough lumber, it is manifestly to the interest of the individual having rough lumber to surface it, if that surfacing can be done at 50 cents per thousand feet, because he thereby would save 50 cents per thousand feet on the freight after surfacing the lumber. This proportion, if correct, would seem to make it necessary to place a higher duty on rough lumber than on the finished article at the mill, because, evidently, the expenditure of what Mr. Scanlan says is the total cost of surfacing on two sides and tonguing and grooving, less than 50 cents a thousand feet, would result in saving a dollar a thousand in freight.

I do not pretend to aver that these statements are according to the absolute facts. The discussion has led to some difference of opinion on that subject; but the difference of opinion which has arisen here indicates that before this schedule can be intelligently voted upon the exact facts with reference to the relation of weight in finished and rough lumber and the exact cost of finishing the rough lumber must be ascertained or we shall vote without sufficient information.

I repeat, that I believed in 1897, and I believe to-night, that a dollar a thousand on rough lumber is ample protection to the sawmill men of the United States, and I shall certainly be subject to a mighty change of thought, and the figures necessary to bring about that change must be presented, before I alter the position I then took after a pretty careful investigation of the subject.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is doubtless aware of the fact that under the \$2 rate we imported a very large quantity of rough lumber—thirty times as much as all grades of finished lumber combined. We ought not to lose sight of the fact that that rough lumber gave employment to American workmen, while the finished lumber, of course, deprived American workmen of just that much labor. So that I think we ought to be careful in fixing the rates, not to have them so arranged that the finished lumber can come in to the detriment of American workmen in the sawmills of the United States. The fact I have stated, that under the \$2 rate we have imported thirty times as much rough lumber as we have of all kinds of finished lumber combined, is, to my mind, very significant, and ought not to be lost sight of.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I understand the rates in the House bill as to finished lumber are substantially the same as those in the Senate bill. It therefore follows that, if the foreign manufacturer of lumber is required to pay 50 cents for surfacing on each side and 50 cents per thousand for the tonguing and grooving process, he must import the lumber in the rough, because the duty on the finished article is practically prohibitive. If the whole of the work can be done in the United States for 50 cents per thousand, how could the importer pay a duty of a dollar and a half extra on the finished product?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have no idea that it can be done for 50 cents a thousand. I have no technical knowledge on that point; but I am not distressed over the fact that we are compelling Canada to send us unfinished lumber here to give employment to American workmen. That does not distress me in the least.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, when the compulsion results in carrying in 400 pounds of waste in every 2,800 pounds of material, I doubt if we are doing very much for our workmen. The shavings, of course, are of some value to burn, but they are scarcely worth their weight in money, as we pay it out for the processes of finishing. I shall be glad to support, on both the rough lumber and on the finished lumber as well, a duty that represents the difference between the cost of producing it here and the cost of producing it beyond the Canadian border.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I do not intend to take up the lumber schedule this evening. When we reach that point, I hope to discuss it at some length. I only rise now to say that it is gratifying to me to know that, no matter how much any one of us may know, or thinks he knows, about the lumber business, there is always something that we can learn. When the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] assumed that I had said something, at least, that I did not intend to say, and that I necessarily knew nothing about the lumber business, he found a Senator here in this room who had ascertained that lumber was often taken from the saw immediately to the plane. It was something, of course, that the Senator had never heard of before. So we are likely in the discussion of this subject to run across things that none of us has ever heard of.

When I said that a certain piece of lumber as it came from the saw went to the planing mill I did not intend to convey the idea necessarily that it came directly from the saw without the intervention of the usual machinery and without being taken over to the drying kiln and from there back to the planing mill; but I intended to express the idea that a particular piece of lumber in the form that it came from the saw went into the planing mill, and the same mill that planes on one side can also

plane upon the other side in the same process practically and can also groove, if necessary.

But, Mr. President, what I did wish to bring out in that discussion was the fact that a difference between the \$1 duty upon rough lumber and the duty of \$2 and \$2.50 upon the finished lumber was not a difference that was based upon the actual cost of transforming the rough into the finished lumber in any of the mills that I know anything about.

I believe that in the southern mills, as a rule, it costs really more to manufacture lumber than it does in the northwestern country; that probably the mills themselves in the great Northwest are more modern, for the most part, at least, and they can handle this lumber more economically than some of the other mills. Any knowledge that I may have, although it may be imperfect, is based almost wholly upon the northern and northwestern mills.

I want to say another thing before I close. I know it is late, and I will only take a moment—in answer to a suggestion that was made by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], stating that the mills in his section of the country were now manufacturing into lumber trees that had grown from the seeds since they had commenced to manufacture lumber in that State. That is in the neighborhood of about from forty-five to fifty years. It is true that some trees may have grown during that time, but what are they? They are nothing but saplings to-day, and why are saplings being cut to-day? Simply because the extreme price of lumber makes it profitable to cut almost anything that will make a lath, as has been suggested by the Senator from Minnesota, and convert it into lumber. That is true all over the State of Minnesota.

I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that I have been over my native State to some extent. Only about a year ago I took a trip from Minneapolis to Duluth, going over one road and returning over another, and in all of that distance of over 100 miles, or about that number of miles, as I remember, just as far as you could see there was nothing but a wilderness of black stumps, without a pine tree and without any other kind of a tree, except little willows and the poplars that are growing up and taking the place of the majestic pines of a few years ago.

I have been over other portions of northern and central Minnesota, and I find practically the same situation there. I have driven for more than 30 miles north of the main line in a country that was once covered by majestic forests, and I could find nothing but burnt stumps, a few willows, a few poplars, and possibly, in some instances, tamaracks. Two years ago I was over in Oregon and followed along one of the great valleys there—the valley of the McKenzie, that once had been well timbered. I saw the work of destruction of the timber baron there. You can travel for mile after mile, and along the hill-sides there is not even any brush left. Every vestige of timber has gone. But when you get away from there into the government reserves and see there majestic trees, whose tops seem almost to kiss the stars at night, you can not help but thank God that you live when you see nature as it is, and as it should be, protected, in this country.

Mr. President, I looked at one of those trees. I sat down upon the stump of an old cedar that was some 9 or 10 feet in diameter. It had been sawed off for several years, so that the check marks and the year rings had begun to manifest themselves. I took out my penknife and started to check off the number of those rings. I started from the center, and when I had counted up to about 500 they had become so fine that they could not be seen by the naked eye. Probably that tree had grown there for fully a thousand years; I have no doubt that it was at least a thousand years old. You can not produce such trees in forty years or fifty years.

You will never produce them again in this country. But what we can do is to preserve our forests just as long as it is possible to preserve them. We know the influence of the forests upon the navigable streams; we know their influence upon the floods of the country; we know their influence upon the farms that are adjoining which may be swept away by a flood in a single night; we know their influence upon the climate; and we know, Mr. President, if we have got any scintilla of feeling for the future and for our children's children, that it is our duty to maintain proper conditions as nearly as possible. We can not go upon the theory that we can reproduce in thirty or forty years that which it has taken the Almighty four thousand years to produce. But I intend to discuss this subject, Mr. President, when I meet it upon the schedules.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 30, 1909, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 29, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 26, was read and approved.

THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the grateful appreciation of the American people be, and hereby is, expressed and the President requested to convey the same to the people of the Turkish Empire that the revolution they have just effected assures to them the precious safeguards of constitutional government and freedom, and that the triumph is unmarred by the execution of the venerable Abdul Hamid or any wholesale slaughter of residents of Constantinople, and of our best wishes for their peace and prosperity and enjoyment in largest measures of all the blessings of civilization.

2. That the President be further requested to inform His Imperial Majesty Mohammed V of the friendly regard of the Government and people of these United States for him, his Government, and people, and our earnest hope and firm confidence that among the earliest achievements of his reign will be the prompt restoration of order throughout his realm and elimination of the appalling atrocities upon Christian missionaries and other non-Moslems which thrill with horror the civilized world.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MACON. Mr. Speaker, this is a little too sudden; I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I assume the resolution will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman rise for the purpose of debating this resolution?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York to withhold his motion for a moment. I desire to make a correction in reference to the issuance of the Congressional Directory. It will only take a moment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I withhold the motion.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of publications made with reference to the delay in the issuance of the Congressional Directory which have been not altogether in accordance with the facts, and I wish to correct the matter. One paper, for instance, stated:

Because Mr. RANDELL of Texas was down in the new issue of the Congressional Directory as "Randell of Tennessee" that same RANDELL had 8,000 copies of the Directory thrown away. Everybody around the Capitol was wondering why the Directories were so long in coming out. A few had been issued and there was a stop. Departments made inquiries. Newspaper offices yelled with vigor. Congressmen wanted to know why—and there wasn't any information on the subject forthcoming—

And so forth.

Another paper said:

The state pride of CHOICE B. RANDELL, Representative of the fourth Texas district, has been a source of great inconvenience in the last ten days to 392 Members of the House, 90 Senators, and a large number of officials and civilians. In the first edition of the Congressional Directory of the Sixty-first Congress Mr. RANDELL was listed as being from Tennessee, and he was so aggrieved at this mistake that the entire edition had to be returned to the Government Printing Office and another edition printed. Besides causing a delay in the distribution of the directory, the error and Mr. RANDELL's insistence that it be rectified have cost the Government a tidy sum of money—

And so forth.

I would not have paid any attention to the matter in the House, but the papers giving the statement out having failed to correct it, I wish to state here that nothing of the kind occurred, and I shall ask the Clerk to read a letter which was handed to me by Mr. A. J. Halford, the compiler of the Directory, which will set the matter straight.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING,
CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY,
Washington, D. C., April 17.

Hon. C. B. RANDELL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Recurring to our conversation of to-day, I desire to state: 1. That the distribution of the first edition of the Congressional Directory was held up in order to make some changes in the organization

of Senate committees necessitated by the appointment of new committees, clerks, and messengers.

2. The postponement was made without suggestion from you and without your knowing that it had been made.

3. These changes having been directed by the Committee on Printing, the error crediting you to the State of Tennessee instead of Texas was corrected. But no delay in the issue of the Directory was made on account of this correction, and no copies of the book were destroyed because of it. Regretting that the matter should have caused you any annoyance, I am,

Yours, sincerely,

A. J. HALFORD, *Compiler*.

PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House gave leave, upon the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILEY], to print an article by Mr. John R. Freeman on the Panama Canal appearing in the May number of the Outlook. I see by referring to that able journal that following the article of Mr. Freeman is an article by Mr. Bunau-Varilla, and a very able editorial review of the two articles. I now ask that the other article and editorial review may also be printed as a part of the supplement to House Document No. 10.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the article by Mr. Bunau-Varilla is a criticism of the present lock-dam canal?

Mr. WANGER. It is.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet on Monday next.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriation for the Deposit Savings Association of Mobile, Ala., E. J. Reed, and J. N. Newkirk (H. Doc. 21), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 8909) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Stamford, in the State of Connecticut—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8910) for an appropriation for enlarging the government building at Lansing, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 8911) to prevent and punish the desecration, mutilation, or improper use of the flag of the United States of America—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 8912) granting pensions to all enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the civil war and the war with Mexico—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8913) to provide for the time and places for holding of the regular terms of the United States circuit and district courts for the western district of the State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8914) to open to settlement and entry under the general provisions of the homestead laws of the United States certain lands in the State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 8915) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Port Jervis, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 8916) to authorize the Secretary of War to procure lock and dam sites for Locks B, C, D, E, and F to be located in the Cumberland River below Nashville, State of Tennessee, and to erect and put in operation locks and dams at said sites, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MORGAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8917) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a new division in the western judicial district of the State of Missouri," approved January 24, 1901—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 8918) for the extension of Seventeenth street NW., from Crescent place to Florida avenue—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 8919) for the improvement of the navigation of the St. Francis River in Arkansas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8920) to establish a subtreasury at the city of St. Paul, Minn.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 51) to amend the Constitution relative to incomes and inheritances—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the legislature of Connecticut, in relation to the inheritance-tax provision in the Payne tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Connecticut, regarding date of the inauguration of the President of the United States—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Memorial of the legislature of Illinois, protesting against the levying of a federal inheritance tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Memorial of the legislature of Illinois, against proposed inheritance tax in the Payne tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRINCE: Memorial of the legislature of Illinois, against the proposed inheritance tax in the Payne tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 8921) granting an increase of pension to William E. Gault—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 8922) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCLAY: A bill (H. R. 8923) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Snoke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 8924) granting an increase of pension to William Henry Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8925) granting an increase of pension to Haydon Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 8926) granting a pension to Christina Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 8927) granting an increase of pension to William R. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8928) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Kimsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8929) to pay Lewis J. Blair, late lieutenant-colonel of the Eighty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, amount found due him by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 8930) granting a pension to Lewis Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8931) granting a pension to Charles W. Lovell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8932) granting a pension to Richard Hogan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOELKER: A bill (H. R. 8933) granting a pension to Birdie Brenock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 8934) granting a pension to W. H. Elmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 8935) granting an increase of pension to Marie Mische—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 8936) granting a pension to James Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8937) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Nester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 8938) to correct the military record of Daniel D. May—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 8939) granting an increase of pension to George D. Salyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8940) granting a pension to Mary C. Gillespie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8941) granting an increase of pension to John E. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 8942) for the relief of the Bolivar Troop Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, of Cleveland, Miss.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOYCE: A bill (H. R. 8943) granting an increase of pension to William J. Seevers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8944) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Mossgrove—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8945) granting an increase of pension to John Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 8946) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Adkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8947) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Atkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8948) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Bayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8949) granting an increase of pension to William H. Begley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8950) granting an increase of pension to Turner Branham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8951) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Cassell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8952) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Charles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8953) granting an increase of pension to James H. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8954) granting an increase of pension to Morgan Clark—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8955) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8956) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Clutts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8957) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah H. Combs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8958) granting an increase of pension to Spencer Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8959) granting an increase of pension to Milton Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8960) granting an increase of pension to William W. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8961) granting an increase of pension to Eli R. Dials—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8962) granting an increase of pension to B. F. Dorsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8963) granting an increase of pension to Robert Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8964) granting an increase of pension to William J. Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8965) granting an increase of pension to John W. Faulkner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8966) granting an increase of pension to William W. Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8967) granting an increase of pension to Charles Franklin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8968) granting an increase of pension to James Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8969) granting an increase of pension to George F. Gose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8970) granting an increase of pension to Lewis W. Gose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8971) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Hager—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8972) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Hammon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8973) granting an increase of pension to William Hobbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8974) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Horn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8975) granting an increase of pension to S. G. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8976) granting an increase of pension to William Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8977) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hutt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8978) granting an increase of pension to Peter Jagers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8979) granting an increase of pension to James Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8980) granting an increase of pension to Elijah King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8981) granting an increase of pension to Hostin Litteral—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8982) granting an increase of pension to Morrison T. McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8983) granting an increase of pension to Edwin McPherson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8984) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. May—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8985) granting an increase of pension to Decatur Maynard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8986) granting an increase of pension to John P. Mead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8987) granting an increase of pension to William Miles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8988) granting an increase of pension to James W. Mollett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8989) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Munsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8990) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Nesbitt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8991) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Norton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8992) granting an increase of pension to John Owens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8993) granting an increase of pension to William H. Overly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8994) granting an increase of pension to William Pack—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8995) granting an increase of pension to Ella Q. Parrish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8996) granting an increase of pension to Irvin Patrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8997) granting an increase of pension to James H. Phelps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8998) granting an increase of pension to William Pinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8999) granting an increase of pension to Peter Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9000) granting an increase of pension to Sanford Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9001) granting an increase of pension to John F. Sebastian—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9002) granting an increase of pension to Floyd M. Sellards—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9003) granting an increase of pension to John C. Smallwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9004) granting an increase of pension to Huron Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9005) granting an increase of pension to Milton Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9006) granting an increase of pension to William Snowden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9007) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Soward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9008) granting an increase of pension to James A. Stamper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9009) granting an increase of pension to James A. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9010) granting an increase of pension to John Townsend—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9011) granting an increase of pension to Dale Treadway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9012) granting an increase of pension to John P. Vaughan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9013) granting an increase of pension to John Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9014) granting an increase of pension to James Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9015) granting an increase of pension to William H. Weddington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9016) granting an increase of pension to John M. Willoughby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9017) granting an increase of pension to J. D. Wyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9018) granting a pension to Mollie Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9019) granting a pension to Bud Adkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9020) granting a pension to George W. Adkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9021) granting a pension to George Amerine—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9022) granting a pension to Milley Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9023) granting a pension to Clay Brandenburg—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9024) granting a pension to William R. Brewer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9025) granting a pension to Georgia A. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9026) granting a pension to George W. Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9027) granting a pension to William Caldwell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9028) granting a pension to Caleb Chenault—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9029) granting a pension to Delilah Colley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9030) granting a pension to Frank P. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9031) granting a pension to John A. Combs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9032) granting a pension to Winston Conley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9033) granting a pension to James Crum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9034) granting a pension to Patrick Daly, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9035) granting a pension to Christopher Alonzo De Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9036) granting a pension to Reuben P. Dennis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9037) granting a pension to Rufus F. Diamond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9038) granting a pension to Lucy Dou-thett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9039) granting a pension to Louie E. Downard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9040) granting a pension to Robert Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9041) granting a pension to Thompson Farmer Frisby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9042) granting a pension to James H. Gilley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9043) granting a pension to Greenville R. Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9044) granting a pension to John Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9045) granting a pension to J. M. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9046) granting a pension to John P. Hazlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9047) granting a pension to Ellen Holbrook—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9048) granting a pension to Jasper Jenkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9049) granting a pension to Thomas Jent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9050) granting a pension to Lemuel Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9051) granting a pension to Ursula Joseph—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9052) granting a pension to Caroline Kidd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9053) granting a pension to David B. Kimbrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9054) granting a pension to William Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9055) granting a pension to John M. Lin-vell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9056) granting a pension to Lewis Lyon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9057) granting a pension to Simpson Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9058) granting a pension to Harriet Maupin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9059) granting a pension to William X. May—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9060) granting a pension to George C. Middaugh—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9061) granting a pension to Sylvester B. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9062) granting a pension to George W. Music—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9063) granting a pension to Alex Owsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9064) granting a pension to John W. Puckett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9065) granting a pension to Frank Risner—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9066) granting a pension to William T. Romes—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9067) granting a pension to N. E. Rowland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9068) granting a pension to William B. Senieur—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9069) granting a pension to McKinley Sewell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9070) granting a pension to Laura Sowards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9071) granting a pension to Emily Sparks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9072) granting a pension to James Stafford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9073) granting a pension to Isaac Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9074) granting a pension to James B. Strong—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9075) granting a pension to Demia T. Stump—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9076) granting a pension to A. H. Sym-son—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9077) granting a pension to Mariba Tackett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9078) granting a pension to Freelin Tay-lor—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9079) granting a pension to Albert Thom-son—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9080) granting a pension to Nace Thomp-son—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9081) granting a pension to Frances Tur-ner—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9082) granting a pension to Morgan J. Treadway—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9083) granting a pension to Susan Webb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9084) granting a pension to Palo Alto Westerfield—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9085) granting a pension to Fannie Wil-son—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9086) restoring to the pension roll the name of Henry Blankenship—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 9087) granting an increase of pension to William Wiley—to the Committee on Invalid Pen-sions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 9088) granting a pension to Sadie E. Coit—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9089) for the relief of James F. Curley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOWDEN: A bill (H. R. 9090) granting an increase of pension to Oscar M. Town—to the Committee on Invalid Pen-sions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 9091) granting an increase of pension to John Flanigan—to the Committee on Invalid Pen-sions.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9092) granting a pension to Antonio Feldman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 9093) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pen-sions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9094) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Barrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 9095) granting an increase of pension to John R. McMasters—to the Committee on In-val-id Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9096) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Payton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9097) granting a pension to John S. Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9098) granting a pension to Charles A. Yager—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9099) granting a pension to Potenciana Soriano Ziegenbein—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9100) making an appropriation for Lizzie Kenamore—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 9101) to grant title to cer-tain public land to the city of Santa Cruz, in the State of Cali-fornia, to be used for street purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 9102) granting an increase of pension to R. A. Sisson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 9103) granting an increase of pension to George Perry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9104) for the relief of John I. Conroy and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9105) for the relief of R. B. Whitacre & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9106) for the relief of Lydia Mahoney—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9107) for the relief of Edward H. Ozmun—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9108) for the relief of A. M. Darling and F. C. Darling—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9109) for the relief of the heirs of Eldred Nunnally, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9110) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Edward Simonton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9111) granting a pension to Jacob Hinkel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9112) granting a pension to T. B. Maloney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9113) granting a pension to Regina Ebert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9114) granting a pension to Mary Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9115) granting a pension to Isaac Labisoniere—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9116) granting a pension to Benjamin Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9117) granting an increase of pension to A. P. Noyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9118) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9119) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Stark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9120) granting an increase of pension to John J. Buckley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9121) granting an increase of pension to Theophilus G. Brunson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9122) granting an increase of pension to Peter Therien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9123) granting an increase of pension to Louis Westhauser—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9124) granting an increase of pension to William Willige—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9125) granting an increase of pension to John G. MacNamara—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9126) to correct the military record of Charles Kostohryz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9127) to correct the military record of Lieut. Col. James P. Walker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9128) to correct the military record of Frank E. Baker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9129) to correct the military record of Lieut. Col. Horace P. Rugg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9130) to correct the military record of Andrew J. Weidle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9131) providing for the retirement of Dr. James B. Ferguson, of the army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TENER: A bill (H. R. 9132) granting an increase of pension to John Pattison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9133) to correct the military record of Patrick H. McGee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9134) to correct the muster of Thomas S. Vale—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: Petition of J. Harriman and others, of Marion, Ohio, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Medford Advancement Association, against a duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of common council of Portage, Wis., for appropriation to repair levee at Portage, on Wisconsin River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CLINE: Petition of Fort Wayne Engraving Company, for duty on post cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Elkhart (Ind.) Carriage Company and others, for removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONRY: Petition of Farm Life, of Chicago, Ill., favoring free lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of D. Auerbach & Sons, of New York, favoring free cocoa—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hide and Leather Association of New York, favoring free hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL: Petition of C. Elias & Bro., of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring protective reduction duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hide and Leather Association of New York City, favoring reduction of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Montgomery Brothers & Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., urging duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of East Buffalo Live Stock Association, urging changes in new tariff bill affecting cattle—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Wool Growers' Association, favoring free wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York City Silk Conditioning Works, favoring revision of tariff on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Thomas & Thompson Company, of Baltimore, Md., urging revision of tariff on disinfectants—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Isaac Prouty & Co., of Spencer, Mass., favoring free hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. & J. Burke, of New York, favoring reduction of tariff on malted liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of The Farmers' Review, of Chicago, against a duty on fertilizers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Alston Lucas Paint Company, of Chicago, Ill., against a proposed duty on wood oil—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Thomas & Thompson Company, of Baltimore, Md., against a duty on sheep dip—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of wholesale merchants of New York, against increase of duty on hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Tousey Varnish Company, of Chicago, favoring retention of duty on China wood oil—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Connell Brothers, of Elgin, Ill., favoring duty on casein and lactarene—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to W. H. Elmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of Metal Stamping Company, requesting reduction of duty on manufactured metal goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Castle Braid Company, requesting hearings on braid tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles N. Prouty & Co., of Spencer, Mass., protesting against a duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mr. Theo. E. Tack, of New York, against free oil—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of lithographers of New York City, urging protection of the industry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Phillip Storninger, of New York City, advocating repeal of duty on live cattle and dressed meats—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York Federation of Women's Clubs, opposing duty on gloves, hosiery, and linens—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Braid Manufacturers' Association of the United States, urging changes in classification of braids, etc., in tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles S. Hopper, jr., urging tax on stocks, bonds, and financial paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Porto Rico, favoring a tariff on sugar and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of President Van Cleave, of St. Louis, favoring a tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles H. Schmitz, of New York City, favoring duty on lithographic supplies—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Luyties Brothers, favoring amendment to the tariff bill to encourage the sale and exportation of articles of domestic manufacture—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Columbus Industrial Alliance, favoring protection along certain lines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hawley & Hoops, protesting tax on cocoa beans—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Manufacturers' Association, protesting reduction of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. Van Lubken, favoring removal of duty on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Porto Rico, favoring duty on coffee, sugar, and tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Business Men's Association of South Norwalk, Conn., for placing paper on free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, for retention of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fred Gutman & Co. of New York, for reduction of duty on safety matches—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Yellow Pine Exchange, favoring a bill to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels in the coasting trade—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of many citizens of North Dakota, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph Nester and James Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of American Masters, Mates, and Pilots, of California Harbor No. 15, against reduction of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Kensington and Howard Lake, Minn., against proposed reduction in tariff on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Commercial Club of Osakis, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN of Missouri: Petition of Samuel Miller, W. A. Joslin, L. S. Thurman, and other citizens of the Fifteenth Congressional District of Missouri, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY: Petition of various farmers' unions of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Missouri, favoring a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ROBINSON: Petitions of J. P. Wait and others, of Altheimer; L. H. Morpew and others, of Stuttgart; Murphey Martin Drug Company, of Pine Bluff; Grand Rapids Transfer Company, of Hot Springs; Globe Shoe and Clothing Company, of Malvern, all in the State of Arkansas, protesting against the establishment of a parcels-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SABATH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles E. Malin—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of Stereotypers' Union, No. 4, of Chicago, and Chicago Mailers' Union, No. 2, favoring same postage rates on second-class mail in town where papers are printed as out of town—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Arthur Folk, of New York, against an increase of duty on tobacco and upholding action of the Senate committee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Durbrow & Hearne Manufacturing Company, of New York, against increase of duty on embroidery machines and needles for the same—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, April 30, 1909.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, of the city of Washington. The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the following causes:

In the cause of Alice H. Pierce, widow of Allen W. Pierce, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 25); and

In the cause of Herbert Harlan and William Beatty Harlan, administrators cum testamento annexo of the estate of David Harlan, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 26).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented house joint resolution No. 9, of the general assembly of Iowa, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IOWA.

SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, W. C. Hayward, secretary of state of the State of Iowa, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 9, as passed by the thirty-third general assembly and approved by the governor April 12, A. D. 1909, as the same appears of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the secretary of state of the State of Iowa.

Done at Des Moines, the capital of the State, April 24, 1909.

[SEAL.]

W. C. HAYWARD,
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 9.

Joint resolution of the thirty-third general assembly of the State of Iowa, making application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

Whereas we believe that Senators of the United States should be elected directly by the voters; and

Whereas to authorize such direct election an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is necessary; and

Whereas the failure of Congress to submit such amendment to the States has made it clear that the only practicable method of securing submission of such amendment to the States is through a constitutional convention, to be called by Congress upon the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of all the States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the general assembly of the State of Iowa:

SECTION 1. That the legislature of the State of Iowa hereby makes application to the Congress of the United States, under Article V of the Constitution of the United States, to call a constitutional convention for proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 2. That this resolution, duly authenticated, shall be delivered forthwith to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, with the request that the same shall be laid before the said Senate and House.

Approved April 12, A. D. 1909.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the congress of the Knights of Labor of Albany, N. Y., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on wood pulp and print paper, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry employees of the Case Cutlery Company, of Kane, Pa., praying for the retention of the proposed duty on imported knives or erasers, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, Massachusetts, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Maryland, South Carolina, Arkansas, Michigan, Oregon, Texas, Virginia, Oklahoma, Nebraska, North Dakota, Idaho, Tennessee, West Virginia, Indiana, Maine, Ohio, Wisconsin, Washington, Idaho, Louisiana, and Pennsylvania, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHIVELY presented petitions of sundry citizens of Indianapolis, Boswell, Fishers, Evansville, and Fairlance, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the repeal of the duty on raw hides, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented petitions of sundry citizens of East Bethel, Newbury, West Woodstock, and Burlington, all in the State of Vermont, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Norwood, Lane, Hunter, Winfield, Ellsworth, Zurich, Caldwell, Canton, Garnett, Burns, and Argonia, all in the State of Kansas, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRYE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Argyle and Riverton, Me., praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.